NPS ARCHIVE
1998.03
TIERNEY, K.

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

THESIS

STUDY OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PRISON INMATES AFFILIATED WITH GANGS AND EXTREMIST GROUPS: TRENDS AND ISSUES FOR ENLISTMENT SCREENING

by

Kathryn E. Tierney

March 1998

Thesis Advisor: Mark J. Eitelberg
Associate Advisor: Martin F. Wiskoff

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)*	2. REPORT DATE March 1998	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
STUDY OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PRISON INMATES AFFILIATED WITH GANGS AND EXTREMIST GROUPS: TRENDS AND ISSUES FOR ENLISTMENT SCREENING

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

6. AUTHOR(S)
Tierney, Kathryn E.

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5000

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT *(maximum 200 words)*

This thesis examines self-identified gang members and extremists incarcerated in Navy and Marine Corps brigs and disciplinary barracks. Information was gathered from interviews conducted with inmates. The interviews focused on several key issues, including reasons for enlisting in the Navy and Marine Corps; truthfulness with recruiters concerning certain illegal activities prior to enlistment, including juvenile arrests and convictions; the nature and severity of crimes for which members were convicted, including links with gangs or extremist groups; and reasons for lack of assimilation and acculturation into military service.

This thesis also provides background information on present enlistment screening procedures, current Department of Defense policies concerning gangs and extremist groups, and demographic data on the characteristics of self-admitted gang members who are incarcerated in a Navy brig. Common themes that emerged from the interviews are presented, and selected summaries are included in an appendix. In addition, the study examines enlistment screening procedures for identifying applicants who have gang or extremist group affiliations, and recommends a number of areas for further research.

14. SUBJECT TERMS
Gangs, Extremism, Accessions, Recruiting, Prison Inmates

15. NUMBER OF PAGES
169

16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UL

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239-18 298-102

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

STUDY OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PRISON INMATES AFFILIATED WITH GANGS AND EXTREMIST GROUPS: TRENDS AND ISSUES FOR ENLISTMENT SCREENING

Kathryn E. Tierney
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., Iowa State University, 1988

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 1998

PS Archive
198.03
Kerney, K

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines self-identified gang members and extremists incarcerated in Navy and Marine Corps brigs and disciplinary barracks. Information was gathered from interviews conducted with inmates. The interviews focused on several key issues, including reasons for enlisting in the Navy and Marine Corps; truthfulness with recruiters concerning certain illegal activities prior to enlistment, including juvenile arrests and convictions; the nature and severity of crimes for which members were convicted, including links with gangs or extremist groups; and reasons for lack of assimilation and acculturation into military service.

This thesis also provides background information on present enlistment screening procedures, current Department of Defense policies concerning gangs and extremist groups, and demographic data on the characteristics of self-admitted gang members who are incarcerated in a Navy brig. Common themes that emerged from the interviews are presented, and selected summaries are included in an appendix. In addition, the study examines enlistment screening procedures for identifying applicants who have gang or extremist group affiliations, and recommends a number of areas for further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. BACKGROUND 1

1. Gangs and Extremist Group Members in the Military 3

2. Recent Events 18

B. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS 26

II. APPROACH 29

A. ORGANIZATION OF STUDY 29

1. Research Questions 29

2. Research Methodology 30

III. RESULTS 37

A. NAVY BRIG DATA RESULTS 37

B. STUDY SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS 49

C. MAJOR THEMES 52

1. A High Percentage of Inmates Were Suspended or Expelled from School 52

2. A Significant Percentage of Inmates Were Incarcerated for Violent Crimes 53

3. Almost One-third of Inmates Had Been Fired from a Previous Job 58

4. Most Inmates Came From Single-Parent Homes 59

5. Almost Half of the Inmates Came From an Abusive Family Environment 59

6. Many Inmates Concealed Their Arrest Histories or Other Criminal Activity at the Time of Enlistment 60

7. The Majority of Inmates Had a Non-Judicial Punishment (NJP) in their Record 62

8. The Majority of Incarceration Crimes are Not Gang-Related 63

9. Most Individuals Joined Gangs Prior to Enlistment 64

10. The Majority of Inmates Had Required Moral Waivers For Enlistment Eligibility 66

11. Most Inmates Had Joined the Military to Better their Life Circumstances 67

12. Many Inmates Had Family Members in Gangs or in Prison as a Result of Gang Affiliation 70

13. The Inmates Joined Gangs Because of Friends, Family, and Making Money 71

IV. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS POLICY AND PROCEDURES 73

A. CURRENT IDENTIFICATION PROCESS 73

B. CURRENT DIRECTIVES 75

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 81

A. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 81

B. RECOMMENDATIONS 83

LIST OF REFERENCES 87

APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW SUMMARIES 89

APPENDIX B. INFORMED CONSENT FORM. 151

APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 153

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION 155

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. MEMBER OF A GANG 38

TABLE 2. LIVED IN AN AREA WITH GANG ACTIVITY 38

TABLE 3. RACE 39

TABLE 4. MARITAL STATUS 39

TABLE 5. PARENTS' MARITAL STATUS 40

TABLE 6. PERSON OR PERSONS LIVED WITH WHILE GROWING UP 40

TABLE 7. EDUCATION 41

TABLE 8. BEEN EXPELLED FROM SCHOOL 42

TABLE 9. FAILED A GRADE IN SCHOOL 42

TABLE 10. FIRED FROM A JOB 43

TABLE 11. IN A JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY 43

TABLE 12. IN A FIGHT RESULTING IN SERIOUS INJURY 43

TABLE 13. FAMILY ALCOHOL PROBLEM 44

TABLE 14. I HAD AN ALCOHOL PROBLEM 44

TABLE 15. FAMILY DRUG PROBLEM 44

TABLE 16. I HAD A DRUG PROBLEM 45

TABLE 17. IN A SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAM 45

TABLE 18. SEXUALLY ABUSED BY A FAMILY MEMBER 46

TABLE 19. SEXUALLY ABUSED BY A NON-FAMILY MEMBER 46

TABLE 20. PHYSICALLY ABUSED BY A FAMILY MEMBER 46

TABLE 21. PHYSICALLY ABUSED BY A NON-FAMILY MEMBER 47

TABLE 22. AROUND VIOLENCE AMONG FAMILY MEMBERS 47

TABLE 23. BEEN TREATED BY A PSYCHOLOGIST OR PSYCHIATRIST 48

TABLE 24. TRIED TO HARM YOURSELF 48

TABLE 25. PAST NON-JUDICIAL PUNISHMENTS 49

TABLE 26. STUDY SAMPLE BY FACILITY 49

TABLE 27. INTERVIEW SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS 50

TABLE 28. CRIMES COMMITTED AND SENTENCES AWARDED BY GENERAL COURTS MARTIAL: SURVEY SAMPLE (N=35) 55

TABLE 29. REASONS FOR JOINING THE MILITARY: SURVEY SAMPLE (N=35) 68

TABLE 30. REASONS FOR JOINING GANGS: SURVEY SAMPLE (N=35) 71

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to sincerely thank my thesis advisors, Dr. Marty Wiskoff, and Professor Mark Eitelberg for their editorial expertise and encouragement through the thesis process. Their guidance, inspiration, and ability to challenge were the foundation of this entire study. This thesis could not have been written without their monumental assistance. I would also like to thank Mr. Mark Flacks for providing an unending supply of informational resources and for helping me organize my thoughts.

There are numerous other individuals who were key in accomplishing this important study. First, I would like to thank those at the Naval Consolidated Brig Miramar for their kindness and support in conducting interviews at the brig including CDR Susan Walters, Commanding Officer; Mr Chuck King, for providing critical statistical data; and Mr. Greg Newbold for his unparalleled efforts in coordination. In addition, I would like to thank Mr. Richard Ward (PERS-84) for his expeditious approval of the project.

At the Marine Corps Brig, Camp Pendleton, I would especially like to thank CWO4 Jess Spradley, Commanding Officer; CWO3 Lynn Mershon, Brig Officer and MGYSGT David Hunter for their tremendous organization and cooperation in arranging inmate interviews. I would also like to thank CWO5 Tim Purcell for his endorsement and support of the study at Headquarters Marine Corps.

At the United States Disciplinary Barracks, I would like to thank COL Marvin Nickels, Commandant; LCOL Floyd Williams, Deputy Commandant; SGT Zeller, and most of all Dr. Bruce Leeson for his patience, coordination effort, and clinical expertise throughout this study.

In addition, I would like to personally thank Dr. W. S. Sellman, Director for Accession Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense, for providing numerous critical points of contact, and abundant informational documents on gangs and extremism.

Last, I would like to thank my family members Sharon, Mike, Susan, Karen and Matt, as well as all my friends for their untiring support and continuous encouragement during the writing of this document. I could not have accomplished this work without their love and support.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

The Navy and Marine Corps suffer from many of the same problems that plague the rest of our diverse society. Gang activity and extremism are two of the most important problems facing our nation today. The majority of people in society are perplexed and fearful about the extent to which gangs and extremist groups have infiltrated certain geographic regions. Given the increased numbers of these groups across America, including some 25,000 gangs with a reported 625,000 members nationwide,[1] it is reasonable to assume that members of these groups will surface within the active-duty military forces. Young adults have the highest risk of becoming involved in gang or extremist activity, because they are actively targeted and recruited for participation in these violent movements. This age group, however, is the same element of society that the armed forces seek to recruit.

---

[1] According to the National Youth Gang Survey, sponsored by the Office of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Program, (1995).

Gang membership or extremist group affiliation poses many potential problems for the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps. The extent of the threat, however, is not clear. Recently, gang activity has increased in and around military bases and appears to be more prevalent than extremist group activity across the country; yet, the number of military personnel involved in such organizations, or the extent of violent crimes committed as a result of gang association is unknown. Consequently, the level of threat to national security or to the safety of military personnel in the future is similarly unclear.

Considering the violent nature of the crimes committed by these groups, the military institution has an obligation to protect society and other service members by not tolerating or retaining individuals who are a potential threat to the majority of the force. Neither should the military continue to employ individuals who possess ideals or attitudes that are clearly detrimental to good order and discipline. At the same time, the military is equally concerned with creating and fostering a positive image with society.

The main objective of this study is as follows: (1) to examine the potential effects of gang membership or extremist affiliation on an individual's lack of

acculturation and assimilation into military service as evidenced by incarceration in Navy and Marine Corps brigs; (2) to evaluate quantitative data on inmate background characteristics from the total incarcerated population of self-admitted gang and extremist group members; and (3) to address Navy and Marine Corps enlistment policies and procedures as they relate to the screening of high-risk individuals.

The study approached these three central goals by conducting interviews at Navy and Marine Corps brigs and disciplinary barracks with inmates who have self-admitted gang or extremist group affiliation. This was the primary mode of inquiry for the study.

1. Gangs and Extremist Group Members in the Military

a) Present Screening Procedures

The question of denying enlistment or subsequent discharge from the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps for past or present, active or passive gang or extremist group membership is primarily a legal issue. First Amendment protections may be involved with respect to whether an individual can be denied entry or be discharged for questionable associations or affiliations with unpopular or potentially violent groups. National security interests do

not always outweigh an individual's right of association or right to privacy. Therefore, legally, the issue is not whether to exclude individuals, but to identify and recruit individuals who do not exhibit high-risk behaviors such as those linked with gangs or extremist groups.

A chief concern is the extent to which gang or extremist group membership is reflected in the ranks of the active-duty military. The presence of individuals who are members of gangs or extremist groups may affect the military's readiness or capacity to perform its mission. It also brings into question whether the attitudes held by gangs and extremist group members correspond with the military's policy to treat all individuals with dignity and respect.

Not surprisingly, given the increased numbers of gangs and racist hate groups throughout the country, there have been several recent instances involving active-duty or former active-duty military members as the perpetrators of crimes, drawing considerable negative media attention. The following are a few of the locations and crimes that have generated press attention and public concern: (1) Oklahoma City, bombing; (2) Fayetteville, North Carolina, murders; (3) Tokyo, Japan, murder; (4) Killeen, Texas, drug-related shooting death; (5) San Diego, larceny; (6) Camp Pendleton,

murder; and (7) the Fort Lewis, Washington, multiple-homicide. These tragedies and others have created an atmosphere of terror, and will be addressed in more detail later in this chapter.

There are four principal screening levels that can aid in identifying members of gangs or racist hate groups. The recruiter, the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS), the background security screening stage, and the enlistment process are all points at which a potential problem may be detected (Arabian, 1996).

The Army's Task Force on Extremist Activities recently concluded that there has been little targeting of U.S. Army soldiers by extremist organizations (Report of the Army's Task Force on Extremist Activities, 1996). One of the recommendations of the Army study was the development of a process to evaluate soldiers for extremist views and participation during recruitment and initial entry screening (Report of the Army's Task Force on Extremist Activities, 1996).

Additionally, there have been Congressional hearings on extremism (U.S. Congress, House, 1996). One outcome of the hearings was a proposal for all services to screen enlistees for gang or extremist group affiliation at the point of enlistment. As of 1998, the Navy and Marine

Corps had limited applicant screening procedures in place. Currently, screening at the MEPS for military service includes tattoo recognition, investigation of a recruit's criminal record according to specific state laws, and a related question during processing for a security clearance. These procedures were not developed specifically to identify members of gangs and extremist groups. Therefore, there is a need to investigate whether the process should be improved.

Establishing an individual's involvement in gangs or extremist groups involves either self-disclosure or in-depth investigation. Gathering this information can be costly in terms of person-hours and monetary expenditures.

Various law enforcement agencies use a number of criteria to determine gang membership. Most major police departments or county law enforcement agencies maintain automated gang membership files with individual records that could be accessible to the military. Most agencies, however, do not have a specific means of classifying individual crimes as gang-related.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) currently tracks membership of several hate groups as do so-called "watchdog" groups such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Southern Poverty Law Center's Klanwatch. This

information is available to the military if an in-depth investigation is performed upon entry or when a security clearance is required. Anti-government group affiliation data are also tracked and available upon request by the Defense Department.

b) Legal Implications

The Constitutional question of whether the First Amendment protects an individual from self-disclosure or investigation of an affiliation with certain groups is answered by the Supreme Court in several different cases. "The First Amendment does not seem to distinguish between legitimate associations and those that are suspect. Rather, all group associations are protected and limited by security issues unique only to a prison environment." The Court has held that "[c]ompelled disclosure, in itself, can seriously infringe on [the] privacy of association and belief guaranteed by the First Amendment." (*Buckley v. Valeo*) Further, "significant encroachments on First Amendment rights of the sort that compelled disclosure imposes cannot be justified by a mere showing of some legitimate governmental interest." (*Buckley v. Valeo*) "So important is the right to associate with whom you wish free from governmental interference that the Court has held assembly,

like speech, is indeed essential in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion, to the end that government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes, if desired, may be obtained by peaceful means." (*DeJonge v. Oregon*)

Another series of cases reviewed by the Supreme Court resulted in the continued protection of the individual "to engage in those activities protected by the First Amendment: speech, assembly, petition for the redress of grievances, and the exercise of religion" (*Roberts v. United States Jaycees*). Further, only in circumstances unique to a prison environment have courts agreed to restrict this fundamental right: "A prison inmate retains those First Amendment rights that are not inconsistent with his status as a prisoner or with legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system" (*Pell v. Procunier*).

The Privacy Act of 1974 was established because of concerns regarding collection of information by the government for reasons not involving law enforcement, previous statute, or informed consent. One of the reasons for the Privacy Act, as cited in a 1974 Senate report, was U.S. Army participation in the collection, use, and dissemination of civilian actions and statements for potential future punitive use. (Valetk, 1997) Therefore,

collecting data by the military on gang membership or extremist group affiliation becomes somewhat problematic.

The national security interest argument allows only the collection and use of information that relates to whether an individual is suitable for employment in a position of public trust. This implies that only active participation in anti-government activities or hate-groups could be considered a plausible reason for denying someone enlistment, or initiating a person's discharge from military service.

c) Gang Phenomenon, Extremist Characteristics and Related Definitions

(1) Active or Passive Participation. Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 1325.6, "Guidelines for Handling Dissident and Protest Activities Among Members of the Armed Forces," dated October 1996, does not clearly specify passive participation, but very clearly defines prohibited activities:

> Military personnel must reject participation in organizations that espouse supremacist causes; attempt to create illegal discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, religion, or national origin; or advocate the use of force or violence, or otherwise engage in efforts, to deprive individuals of their civil rights. Active participation, such as publicly demonstrating or

> rallying, fund raising, recruiting and training members, and organizing or leading such organizations, or otherwise engaging in activities in relation to such organizations or in furtherance of the objectives of such organizations that are viewed by the commander to be detrimental to the good order, discipline, or mission accomplishment of the unit, is incompatible with Military Service, and is, therefore, prohibited. Commanders have authority to employ the full range of administrative procedures, including separation or appropriate disciplinary action against military personnel who actively participate in such groups. (U.S. Department of Defense, 1996, 3.5.8)

For the purpose of this study, the distinction between active and passive extremist group participation is used according to the definition provided in Army Regulation (AR) 600-20, "Army Command Policy." AR 600-20 mirrors DOD Directive 1325.6; however, it provides a needed differentiation between active and passive participation as follows:

> The activities of extremist organizations are inconsistent with the responsibilities of military service. Active participation by soldiers is prohibited. Military personnel, duty-bound, to uphold the Constitution, must reject participation in organizations which: (1) espouse supremacist causes; (2) attempt to create illegal discrimination based on race, creed, color, gender, religion, or national origin; (3) advocate the use of force or violence, or otherwise engage in efforts to deprive individuals of their civil rights. Passive activities, such as mere membership, receiving literature in the mail, or presence at an event, although strongly discouraged as incompatible with military service,

> are not prohibited by Army policy. (U.S. Department of the Army, 1988, chap. 4-12)

The prohibited activities concerning extremist groups include the following:

> (1) participating in a public demonstration or rally; (2) knowingly attending a meeting or activity while on duty, when in uniform, when in a foreign country, or in violation of off-limits sanctions or Commander's order; (3) conducting fund-raising activities; (4) recruiting or training members (including encouraging other soldiers to join); (5) organizing or leading such a group; (6) distributing literature on or off a military installation; and (7) Participating in any activity that is in violation of regulations, constitutes a breach of law and order, or is likely to result in violence. (U.S. Department of the Army, 1988, chap. 4-12)

(2) Gang. On a very basic level, a "gang" can be described simply as a "group of people working or acting together" (Guralink, 1983, p. 251). In this study, however, the focus is specifically on gangs that are violent in nature and that participate primarily in illegal activities. The following multidimensional definition is used:

> A gang is an organization or group with a recognized leader and the less powerful under that command, is unified and stays together in peaceful times and in conflict, shows its unity in obvious ways, and its activities are either criminal or threatening to a larger society. (United States Army Criminal Investigation Command, 1992, p. 1)

There are many different ways to categorize gangs, including by the types of crimes they commit. Some gangs are well-known for executing particular types of crimes, for example, narcotics trafficking or supplying large quantities of illegal weapons. Others are known for capitalizing on prostitution or for their involvement in illicit money-laundering schemes.

Another categorization of gangs is based on ethnicity. Some of the largest black gangs include the Bloods and the Crips, whereas well-known Hispanic gangs include La Familia, Surenos, Nortenos, and the Mexican Mafia.

There are a number of scenarios where young military personnel may be targeted for recruitment by gangs. Adult prison gangs have recently begun to direct the activity of youth street gangs, pushing them into specific organized crime rings involved in drug and weapons trafficking (*A & E Investigative Reports*, 1998). This group may actively target service members based on the accessibility to large quantities of military weapons, and the gangs' perception that military personnel have access to a thriving drug market through overseas travel.

Some individuals who were affiliated with a particular gang prior to enlistment may be attracted

to other enlisted personnel with similar backgrounds and interests. An example might be where Bloods are hanging out with other Bloods on a Navy ship, and, consequently, reverting back to previous, deviant patterns of behavior.

(3) Extremism. Extremism is a completely different phenomenon from that of gangs, although some groups who hold extremist ideals, as illustrated by the Neo-Nazi Skinhead movement, are also considered to be gangs. The definition of extremism is "going to extremes, especially in politics" (Guralink, 1983, p. 218). It is important to note, however, that when society talks about extremism or extremist group ideals, it is not appropriate to repress individuals whose only act is to criticize the government. A person's Constitutional right to free speech allows the expression of anti-government ideals. Rather, behavior that is considered to fall outside the bounds of "reasonable" expression or may be harmful to others is generally considered extremist in nature. Another definition of extremism is the following:

> The opposition to principles of inclusion and social equity, defines right-wing extremism in the United States. Hostility toward the federal government in particular has characterized the vanguard of organized extremism. (Schwartz, 1996, p. V-VI)

(4) Extremist Group. For the purpose of this study, an extremist group is defined as:

> A collection of like-minded individuals joined together in support of a common cause outside the norms of the majority of society. The causes, and the vehicles to support those causes, may or may not be clearly articulated. If so, they may or may not be truthfully stated. Their cause or causes may be classified as racist, supremacist, or "anti" something that is considered to be legitimate or necessary by the rest of society.... (Anderson, 1996, p. 37)

(5) Lunatic Fringe. The definition of lunatic fringe in the study is based on the following:

> Those radical zealots, either on the left or right, relatively few in number, who comprise the far ends of the extremist continuum. Usually they become so committed to a cause and totally consumed with anger and disillusionment they conduct violent actions, or incite others to do so, to strike out at whomever or whatever, they deem to be the enemy. They often consider themselves to be revolutionary warriors fighting for a just cause. The term is often used to describe the far end of the extreme right-wing. (Anderson, 1996, p. 38)

(6) Right-Wing. Another term used in the study is right-wing, defined as follows:

> Used to refer to a person, group or cause that tends to be very conservative, primarily republican, and capitalistic. One who believes in and supports free-market economies, individual and states rights; favors individual versus collective enterprises, and minimal or no interference by the federal government. The term may be used to describe different degrees of commitment to those

> beliefs, ranging from moderate to the radical extreme. The continuum progresses from: (1) conservative, to (2) right-wing, to (3) extreme right-wing, to (4) the lunatic fringe. (Anderson, 1996, p. 41)

(7) Skinheads (Neo-Nazi). One of the largest and most well-known hate-groups is the racist Skinheads. It is important to note that, although an individual's choice of hairstyle and dress may be typically identified with Skinheads, this does not automatically indicate Neo-Nazi or racist affiliation. Most members of these extremist groups are insecure young individuals who are desperately seeking approval from peers in the hope of establishing a sense of belonging and group identity. (United States Army Criminal Investigation Command 1992)

The foremost ideology of Skinheads includes xenophobia (the fear or hatred of strangers or foreigners), Nazism, and racial or religious bigotry (including high levels of anti-Semitism). There is a strongly-held belief among these individuals that Jews are here to denounce whites through civil rights and affirmative action. In addition, members of this group tend to be openly violent in their expression of opposition to other races, and they show a fervent hatred for African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and gays. (United States Army Criminal Investigation Command, 1992)

As previously stated, the problem of gangs and extremism has recently come to light in the armed forces. This is not to say that these issues are new, or that the problem did not exist before, only that it was never previously perceived as a threat within the Navy and Marine Corps. Gangs and extremist groups have become an issue of considerable media focus. This phenomenon has continued to escalate to the point that the military has instituted numerous task forces and subcommittees to study the extent and nature of the problem.

As a subculture of society, it was only a matter of time before infiltration of gangs in the military became a problem to be acknowledged and addressed. It is currently impossible to deny the existence of gangs in the ranks. Since the recruit pool is the civilian youth population, one could assume that human behavior within the ranks approximates that of the civilian youth population. In actuality, however, the military represents a selected sample: applicants for enlistment must meet certain eligibility criteria, which can restrict entry by population segments that may be more prone toward racist attitudes or a gang mentality. At the same time, the military should allow some flexibility in its screening process for the enlistment

of individuals who are otherwise qualified and wish to improve their life circumstances.

Extremism is another ideology that has become a serious threat to social order. As outlined above, one would expect that there is some degree of the extremist ideology present in the military. Recent inquiry concerning the issue suggests that such views or activities are quite limited within the active-duty force. (U.S. Congress, House, 1994). This may be due, in part, to the military's "zero-tolerance" policy for service members involved in extremist or racial activities. Additionally, awareness of the potential problems associated with certain right-wing factions has stepped up efforts to carefully screen potentially volatile individuals who apply for enlistment.

A more urgent concern is the military's reaction to the few service members identified with this type of extremist attitude. These individuals must be prevented from becoming a detriment to the cohesion of the military unit. The Supreme Court has stated unequivocally that "the military is, by necessity, a specialized society separate from civilian society," which "must insist upon a respect for duty and a discipline without counterpart in civilian life." (U.S. Congress, House, 1996, p. 5)

2. Recent Events

In 1996, Congressional hearings were held in response to several violent crimes committed by active-duty service members. A shocking military statistic comes from the Naval Consolidated Brig System Program Evaluation Office. With a population sample of 4,825 inmates, from January 1992 to November 1997, 9.5 percent of incarcerated Navy and Marine Corps members admitted to some sort of gang affiliation. (King, 1997, p. 2) The following information outlines recent events concerning gang activity and extremism throughout society, specifically, recent incidents involving armed forces personnel.

a) Oklahoma City Bombing

One significant event involving extremist group activities was the Oklahoma City Bombing of the Murrah building on 19 April 1995. This violent act has been called the "worst act of domestic violence in United States history" (Anderson, 1996, p. 56). The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF), a local Army Recruiting Station, and other federal agencies were located in the Murrah building. Additional uncontested facts of this tragedy are as follows:

(1) Death Toll. One-hundred and sixty-nine people were killed, including 19 children, as a result of the destruction of the nine-story Alfred P. Murrah federal building in downtown Oklahoma.

(2) Bombing Plan. The explosive device was a 5,000-pound fertilizer bomb, placed in a rental truck parked in the street next to the building. The bomb blast occurred on 19 April 1995 at 9:02 AM. In the book, *The Turner Diaries*, the futuristic race war against the U.S. government is started by a 5,000-pound fertilizer bomb that a "patriot" detonates in a rental truck in front of the FBI building at 9:15 AM on 19 April 1995. (Anderson, 1996, p. 56)

Right-wing supporters have suggested that the federal government itself was behind the bombing. This conspiracy theory contended that the bombing was an attempt by the government to instill fear into the general population of the "radical right-wing extremists to hasten the passage of the Omnibus Anti-Terrorism Crime Bill that had passed the Senate but was stuck in the House at the time." (Anderson, 1996, p. 57)

The individuals charged with murder due to the bombings were two former Army soldiers. Timothy McVeigh, a

former Army sergeant, was "highly influenced by reading the novel, *The Turner Diaries,* and actively expressed his extremist views and made attempts to get other soldiers to read it while on active-duty" (Anderson, 1996, p. 59). The co-defendant, Terry Nichols, a former Army private, was somewhat embittered and felt he "suffered financially due to what they believed were unconstitutional federal government policies." (Anderson, 1996, p. 60)

b) Fayetteville, North Carolina Murders

The House National Security Committee held a hearing on extremist activity in the military on 25 June 1996 as a result of the Fayetteville murders. The following facts are derived from this testimony. (U.S. Congress, House, 1996)

On 7 December 1995, three white Army soldiers stationed at Fort Bragg were indicted on charges of killing a local African-American civilian couple. The couple, Jackie Burden and Michael James, were standing on a street corner when they were shot in the head. Two of the three soldiers involved in the "racially-motivated" incident apparently were affiliated with a local Skinhead group, and the third soldier was found to have "Nazi and supremacist" literature in his room.

c) Camp Pendleton Homicide

March of 1996 was particularly disturbing for the Marines at Camp Pendleton, California. An active-duty sergeant took the life of his Executive Officer at point-blank range with a .45-caliber handgun. He then proceeded to seriously wound his Commanding Officer who had rushed out to investigate the commotion in the outer-office.

Although it was never proven that this was a gang-related murder, the perpetrator had distinctive gang-related tattoos on his body; specifically, two darkened-in teardrops on the left side of his face, which, in many gangs, signifies that the wearer of the tattoo has taken the life of another person. The sergeant claimed that he "did it for the brown side, and that he was tired of being discriminated against" (Philpott, 1997, p. 151). This statement was an indication of his perception of discrimination against Hispanics. He was subsequently court-martialed on multiple charges, including premeditated murder, attempted murder, carrying a concealed weapon, and assault with a deadly weapon. He was sentenced to death and was awaiting execution as of March 1998. (Associated Press, 1996)

d) Tokyo, Japan Murder

In Tokyo, Japan, a Marine corporal and a Marine lance corporal were found guilty of killing another Marine stationed at Iwakuni Marine Corps Air Station. According to the overseas military newspaper, *Stars and Stripes*, both were accused of killing a Marine Corps sergeant for disclosing information to investigators concerning a notorious Latino gang, La Familia. The victim was discovered floating in a nearby ditch after having received multiple stab wounds. One of the convicted Marines received a sentence of 30 years, and the other was sentenced to 40 years in prison. (Associated Press, 1994)

e) Killeen, Texas Drug-related Shooting Death

Another violent crime that caused increased military unrest was committed at Fort Hood in Killeen, Texas. The accused was an active-duty private, affiliated with a Los Angeles street gang, and well-known by a recognized moniker, or nickname. The soldier was involved in a drug-related shooting near a Killeen apartment complex. Local authorities believed that the incident demonstrated how gang members were using the military to "train for

crime." The soldier was eventually tried for murder, convicted, and sentenced to life in prison. (Payne, 1994)

f) Arlington, Texas Discovery

It came as quite a shock to law enforcement officials in Arlington, Texas when, in 1994, an off-duty soldier stationed at Fort Hood was found to be an active member of one of the city's most dangerous and criminally-involved gangs. The 25-year-old service member was found with a distinctive tattoo of the gang's initials across his stomach in the shape of a horseshoe. He was also widely known by his gang moniker and was reportedly hanging out with the "OG" (or original gangster) of the gang. (Payne, 1994)

g) Midwest Not Immune

Six active-duty soldiers, stationed at Fort Riley, Kansas, were caught scaling the fence at Six Flags Over Texas to avoid paying the entrance fee. All six of the individuals claimed affiliation with a recognized Southern California gang, and the soldiers were also in possession of serrated folding knives. (Payne, 1994)

h) Not Just the Army

In a May 1992 report titled, "Street Gangs: The Air Force Connection," the Air Force Office of Special Investigations attempted to raise awareness of the gang problem. The report noted that active-duty service personnel, as well as their dependents, are being actively targeted and recruited for membership in violent movements. The report included accounts of involvement by Air Force personnel in numerous illicit activities, including drive-by shootings, assaults, and drug trafficking. (Payne, 1994)

Many gangs believe the Air Force has the capability to smuggle illicit drugs and contraband aboard military aircraft to many geographic regions of the country. Another perception by gang members is that all military personnel have ready access to military weapons and weapons training. Thus, many gangs are reportedly selecting individuals from within their own ranks to infiltrate the military. (Payne, 1994)

i) Sailors Guilty, Too

There have been numerous accounts of missing weapons as well as ammunition from military bases around the world. In some cases, military members are stealing

military equipment, and their gangs provide a ready market for the stolen government property.

In 1994, two Navy sailors were arrested in San Diego, California for stealing a case of live grenades from their own ship's supplies. Only seven of the grenades were eventually recovered, and the other 18 were sold to a street gang in Los Angeles County. The missing grenades were never recovered. (Payne, 1994)

j) Fort Lewis, Washington Multiple-Homicide

One of the most lurid tales of gang homicide was committed in 1994, just south of Tacoma, Washington in an area known for its street gang problems. The entire family of an Army sergeant was brutally slashed and hacked to death in its home. Three children (ages 2, 4, and 7) and their father perished in the attack, while the active-duty mother was away from home, temporarily assigned to duty in South Korea.

The FBI and local authorities believe the murders may have some connection to drug crimes in the area. Five individuals were questioned in connection with the murders. Two of the suspects were active-duty soldiers stationed at Fort Lewis. (Egan, 1994)

B. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

Chapter II of the thesis presents the approach used to conduct the study, including the research questions and the research methodology employed. Chapter III contains demographic data for all personnel entering Navy brigs. In addition, summaries of the prominent themes that emerged from interviews with incarcerated service members are included. A comparison of demographic data for the sample is presented, including rank, service, race, age, marital status, education level, identification marks, total service time, and highest grade held. Chapter IV is a discussion of current Navy and Marine Corps policies. Enlistment screening policies regarding tattoos, body piercing, and branding are reviewed, as well as the DOD Directive 1325.6, "Guidelines For Handling Dissident and Protest Activities Among Members of the Armed Forces." Chapter V presents conclusions concerning Navy and Marine Corps members with gang or extremist group affiliation, and their effect on the active-duty military force. In addition, several policy areas are listed that may need to be reviewed to improve enlistment screening procedures for high-risk individuals, as well as recommendations for further research. Appendix A contains selected summaries of the interviews that were conducted. Appendix B presents an example of the informed

consent form signed by individuals who consented to be interviewed; and the semi-structured interview questions are provided in Appendix C.

II. APPROACH

A. ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

1. Research Questions

This research focuses on several specific questions:

(1) What were the life circumstances of military personnel who were members of gangs and incarcerated for committing a crime?

(2) Why did self-admitted gang members, currently in prison, join the military; and were they truthful with recruiters concerning gang or extremist-related activity prior to enlistment?

(3) What was the nature and severity of offenses committed for which members were convicted; and were these offenses related to gang or extremist group membership?

(4) Are the Navy and Marine Corps doing a sufficient job of identifying and screening high-risk individuals prior to enlistment; and, if not, how can the services improve the screening process?

2. Research Methodology

a) Sample and Procedures

In-depth, focused interviews were conducted with incarcerated Navy and Marine Corps members who admitted to gang or extremist group membership. Interview sites were chosen based on two criteria: convenient location and the expectation that various correctional facilities would provide wide diversity in the nature and severity of crimes committed. Selected sites included the Naval Consolidated Brig, Miramar, CA; the Marine Corps Brig, Camp Pendleton, CA; and the United States Disciplinary Barracks (USDB), Fort Leavenworth, KS.

Each subject volunteered to participate in a confidential interview, provided that no Privacy Act information be included in the final report. The sample consisted of 35 individuals from the three different confinement locations. The sample size was limited due to the in-depth nature of the interviews (which were approximately 60-90 minutes in length), the available population of gang or extremist group members, and the restricted time frame for the study. The interviewees had a wide range of pay grades, from E1 through E6, and they represented a broad spectrum of Navy ratings (or

occupations) and Marine Corps Military Occupational Specialties (MOSs).

The strategy used for identifying potential subjects at the Naval Consolidated Brig, Miramar was the Navy Corrections Program Life History Information Questionnaire, routinely administered to all active-duty members entering any Navy brig. Individuals were chosen for in-depth interviews based on their positive response to the question, "Have you ever been a member of a gang?" The subjects were then asked to tell their life story in the context of five common themes, including family, job, school, associations, and reasons for enlistment. Specific questions were posed in a semi-structured interview format as per Appendix C. The question of extremist group affiliation was not included on the Navy Corrections Program Life History Questionnaire.

At the Camp Pendleton Brig, the gang affiliation question was routinely posed at the point of inprocessing, on a Family History Questionnaire. In addition, in cases where inmates had previously claimed affiliation with a particular gang or extremist group, subjects were chosen based on recommendations by counseling or brig staff members. Further, subjects were also chosen for interviews based on the presence of known gang-related tattoos. The

question of extremist group affiliation was not posed to the inmates on the Family History Questionnaire.

The approach used at the United States Disciplinary Barracks (USDB) involved a slightly different sampling strategy. The Life History Questionnaire is not administered upon initial confinement; therefore, a shortened (17 question) version of the Navy Corrections Program Life History Questionnaire was developed by the interviewer. It incorporated four main themes, including educational information, work history, family background, and group association information. Individuals were then selected for interviews based on a positive response to the following questions: (1) Have you ever been a member of a gang?; and (2) Have you ever been a member of a group that someone else might consider extremist in nature?

At the USDB, 97 percent of the Navy and Marine Corps population were contacted concerning participation in the study. The remaining 3 percent were excluded since they were deemed to be a significantly high security risk by the brig staff. Potential subjects were gathered in small groups of no more than 8 inmates at a time, and were given background information about the study. They were then asked if they would volunteer to participate. Forty-seven

percent of the population agreed to an in-depth interview, but did not self-admit gang or extremist group affiliation.

The self-admission percentage was slightly less than the interviewer expected. There were only 35 self-admitted gang or extremist group members in the sample. At Miramar, 7 individuals self-admitted gang affiliation out of a total brig population of 220 (3.2 percent); at Camp Pendleton, 14 individuals self-admitted gang affiliation out of a total brig population of 224 (6.3 percent); and at the USDB, 14 individuals self-admitted gang or extremist group affiliation out of a total Navy and Marine Corps disciplinary barracks population of 218 (6.4 percent).

Inmates were generally reluctant to admit to or talk about gang affiliation for numerous reasons. Some of the individuals at USDB may have been more reluctant to self-admit affiliations because they were specifically asked to participate in a research project. It is more likely that they would have been truthful on the questionnaire, if it had been completed at the initial incarceration point. For example, the questionnaires at Miramar and Camp Pendleton were administered as part of inprocessing, as opposed to directly asking for participation in an ongoing study.

The first and largest problem the interviewer faced was the "confidentiality issue." In general, inmates do not trust the penal institutions in which they are incarcerated. They have a serious mistrust of the nature and use of data collection. Many inmates stated that, in several previous instances, their confidentiality had been breached when speaking with counselors, researchers, or brig staff members.

A second prevalent concern by the inmates, especially at the USDB, was that the researcher was working for the brig staff to collect data that could be held against them in the future. Many inmates told the interviewer that the rumor inside the prison walls was that the researcher was "spying" for the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) and the Army Central Intelligence Division (CID). Many others feared that the research was being conducted at the behest of the Disciplinary Barrack's Warden, an Army colonel. The most prominent fear was that anyone who consented to an interview would be labeled a "gangster" to hold them personally accountable for future unrest within the prison.

Others stated that they had significantly lengthy sentences, for example, 20-50 years, and that they wanted to keep a low profile throughout their incarceration. They

were determined to keep themselves out of the spotlight of the staff and cadre by not volunteering or participating in anything.

A final reason that was given for non-self-disclosure was the fact that, by consenting to an interview, the individuals knew they would be asked to discuss their past and their crimes, in depth. Many of those interviewed stated that they felt incredibly guilty for their crimes, and that it "hurt" to talk about what they had done. Others refused to talk because of the negative nature of their past family relations.

There were no individuals in any of the brigs or disciplinary barracks who self-admitted extremist beliefs, who also fit the criteria of the established definition of extremism. Therefore, Chapter III, the results section, and the remainder of this thesis include only data on self-admitted gang members.

b) Interview Parameters

All questions posed revolved around five main themes. Of primary concern were: (1) life circumstances of individuals who decided to join a gang, including whether they joined pre- or post-enlistment; (2) individual involvement with juvenile authorities prior to enlistment;

(3) motivating reasons for enlistment in the military; (4) the point in service where the individual failed to acculturate, as evidenced by incarceration; and (5) the nature and severity of crimes committed leading to incarceration.

Additionally, demographic data of the sample were collected for comparison, including rank, race or ethnicity, marital status, education level, past non-judicial punishments, total service time, highest grade held, presence of gang-related tattoos, and details of crimes committed, including sentences awarded.

III. RESULTS

The results from the gang study are organized into the following three sections. First, the Navy brig data are presented to assist the reader in understanding the brig population who admitted to gang membership. The second section provides demographic data on the 35 individuals who were interviewed in the study, and the final section contains the major themes that emerged from the research.

A. NAVY BRIG DATA RESULTS

Following is a summary of significant demographic variables concerning all personnel entering Navy Brigs. The sample size is 4,825. The period covers 1992 through 1997.[2] The information was extracted from the Navy Corrections Management Information System (CORMIS) database, maintained by the Office of Program Management, Naval Consolidated Brig, Miramar. The information is presented to give the reader a general idea of the significantly dysfunctional background experienced by many of the self-admitted gang members.

---

[2] King, Charles. 1997. Gang Overview, Navy Corrections 1992-Present. San Diego, CA: Naval Consolidated Brig.

Table 1 shows that, of the total Navy brig population, 460, or 9.5 percent, admitted to gang membership. At the same time, Table 2 indicates that 38.5 percent of the Navy sample population lived in an area where there was gang activity.

Table 1. Member of a Gang

	Frequency	Percent
No	4,365	90.5
Yes	460	9.5
Total	4,825	100.0

Table 2. Lived in an Area With Gang Activity

	Frequency	Percent
No	2,967	61.5
Yes	1,858	38.5
Total	4,825	100.0

Table 3 shows the breakdown of self-admitted gang members by race (Hispanics are included in the "white" category). The data show that the largest proportion of the sample population is black, at 46.1 percent. The second highest category is white, accounting for another 43.2 percent of the sample population.

Table 3. Race

	Frequency	Percent
White	199	43.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	2.0
Black	212	46.1
American Indian/ Alaskan	4	0.9
Other	36	7.8
Total	460	100.0

Table 4 indicates that the majority of self-admitted gang members are single, accounting for 62.8 percent of the sample. The second highest category is married (128 of 460), at 27.8 percent.

Table 4. Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	24	5.2
Common Law	4	0.9
Single	289	62.8
Divorced	7	1.6
Married	128	27.8
Separated	8	1.7
Total	460	100.0

Table 5 reveals that an extremely large portion of the self-admitted gang members come from broken homes; in this case, 190 reported that their parents were divorced or separated (41.3 percent). A second notable finding is that

36.3 percent, or 167 inmates, stated that their parents were married during the majority of their juvenile lives.

Table 5. Parents' Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	9	2.0
Married	167	36.3
Divorced/Separated	190	41.3
Both Deceased	2	0.4
Father Deceased	28	6.1
Mother Deceased	12	2.6
Never Married	52	11.3
Total	460	100.0

Table 6 shows that, although the majority of individuals lived primarily with both parents (40.7 percent), a high percentage lived with their mother alone (124 of 460), representing 27.0 percent of the sample population.

Table 6. Person or Persons Lived With While Growing Up

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	12	2.6
Both Parents	187	40.7
Mother Alone	124	27.0
Mother & Stepfather	65	14.1
Father Alone	15	3.2
Father & Stepmother	11	2.4
Grandparents	28	6.1
Other Relatives	10	2.2
Foster Home	8	1.7
Total	460	100.0

Table 7 shows the education level of the self-admitted gang members. Sixty-eight percent are high school graduates. Surprisingly, almost 12 percent (54 of 460) indicated that they had completed some college, but had not earned a degree. Table 8, on the other hand, indicates that 39.1 percent of the prisoners reported they had been expelled from school at least once. It is known that past failures in school can contribute significantly to a higher juvenile delinquency rate (Bynum and Thompson, 1996). Table 9 further depicts that 171 of the 460 self-admitted gang members, or 37.2 percent, had failed a grade in primary or secondary school.

Table 7. Education

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	30	6.5
Less than High School Grad	16	3.5
High School Equivalency (GED)	38	8.3
High School Grad	314	68.3
Some College without Degree	54	11.7
Associate's Degree	7	1.5
Bachelor's Degree	1	0.2
Total	460	100.0

Table 8. Been Expelled From School

	Frequency	Percent
No	280	60.9
Yes	180	39.1
Total	460	100.0

Table 9. Failed a Grade in School

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	0.2
No	288	62.6
Yes	171	37.2
Total	460	100.0

The data displayed in Tables 10, 11, and 12 suggest that patterns of misconduct from earlier years can spill over into adulthood, as evidenced by incarceration of the subjects. Specifically, Table 10 shows that 126 prisoners had been fired from at least one job prior to military service (27.4 percent). Table 11 indicates that almost 19 percent had been incarcerated in a juvenile detention facility; and Table 12 shows that more than two out of three self-admitted gang members (67.8 percent) had at some point been in a fight that resulted in serious injury.

Table 10. Fired From a Job

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	2	0.4
No	332	72.2
Yes	126	27.4
Total	460	100.0

Table 11. In a Juvenile Detention Facility

	Frequency	Percent
No	376	81.7
Yes	84	18.3
Total	460	100.0

Table 12. In a Fight Resulting in Serious Injury

	Frequency	Percent
No	148	32.2
Yes	312	67.8
Total	460	100.0

As shown in Table 13, a large portion of self-admitted gang members, 41.1 percent (189 of 460), reported that there was a significant problem with alcohol among family members. At the same time, Table 14 shows that only 9.6 percent of the sample population indicated a personal problem with alcohol.

Table 13. Family Alcohol Problem

	Frequency	Percent
No	271	58.9
Yes	189	41.1
Total	460	100.0

Table 14. I Had an Alcohol Problem

	Frequency	Percent
No	416	90.4
Yes	44	9.6
Total	460	100.0

Family dysfunction was not only represented by problems with alcohol. Other reported addictions included drug abuse. As seen in Table 15, nearly one-third (28.3 percent) of the individuals in the sample reported that some member in their family suffered from a drug problem. Table 16 shows that approximately 7.2 percent of the self-admitted gang members reported that they, personally, had a drug problem.

Table 15. Family Drug Problem

	Frequency	Percent
No	330	71.7
Yes	130	28.3
Total	460	100.0

Table 16. I Had a Drug Problem

	Frequency	Percent
No	427	92.8
Yes	33	7.2
Total	460	100.0

Fifty-seven inmates (12.4 percent) reported having been treated in a substance abuse program as a juvenile, as shown in Table 17.

Table 17. In a Substance Abuse Program

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	0.2
No	402	87.4
Yes	57	12.4
Total	460	100.0

A number of other problems were reported by portions of the sample population. For example, Table 18 shows that 2.8 percent of the inmates were victims of sexual abuse by a family member; and, as seen in Table 19, 7.4 percent were sexually abused by non-family members.

Table 18. Sexually Abused By a Family Member

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	6	1.3
No	441	95.9
Yes	13	2.8
Total	460	100.0

Table 19. Sexually Abused by a Non-Family Member

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	2	0.4
No	424	92.2
Yes	34	7.4
Total	460	100.0

As many as one in five inmates, or 20.4 percent, stated they had suffered from physical abuse by a family member, as shown in Table 20. At the same time, just over 10 percent of the self-admitted gang members stated that they were physically abused at the hands of a non-family member (see Table 21).

Table 20. Physically Abused by a Family Member

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	4	0.9
No	362	78.7
Yes	94	20.4
Total	460	100.0

Table 21. Physically Abused by a Non-Family Member

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	6	1.3
No	407	88.5
Yes	47	10.2
Total	460	100.0

A stable and healthy home life was not the norm for this sample population. More than half of the self-admitted gang members (53.5 percent) reported being around violence among family members, as shown in Table 22. Additionally, a relatively high proportion (27.8 percent) had been treated by a psychologist or a psychiatrist, as shown in Table 23. And, Table 24 reveals that some 13 percent of the prison inmates had at some point tried to harm themselves physically.

Table 22. Around Violence Among Family Members

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	0.2
No	213	46.3
Yes	246	53.5
Total	460	100.0

Table 23. Been Treated by a Psychologist or Psychiatrist

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	3	0.7
No	329	71.5
Yes	128	27.8
Total	460	100.0

Table 24. Tried to Harm Yourself

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	5	1.1
No	395	85.9
Yes	60	13.0
Total	460	100.0

Table 25 indicates that over 40 percent of the inmates, and self-admitted gang members, claimed to have had no previous non-judicial punishment (NJP) while in the Navy or Marine Corps. About one-fourth of the inmates admitted to at least one NJP, and 17 percent confessed to two or more NJPs while serving in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Table 25. Past Non-Judicial Punishments

	Frequency	Percent
Missing	70	15.2
0	196	42.6
1	114	24.8
2	57	12.4
3	12	2.6
4	8	1.7
5	3	0.7
Total	460	100.0

B. STUDY SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

The interview sample for the present study included 35 inmates, distributed as follows by the facility in which they were incarcerated:

Table 26. Study Sample by Facility

Facility	Number of Inmates in Sample
Naval Consolidated Brig, Miramar, CA	7
Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Brig, CA	14
U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Ft. Leavenworth, KS	14
Total	35

Various demographic characteristics of the sample are displayed in Table 27. Of specific note is the fact that 40.0 percent of the sample had attained the grade of E-3,

while 25.0 percent had attained the grade of just E-2. The majority of self-admitted gang members were Marines, representing 65.7 percent of the inmates interviewed. More than 50.0 percent were black, and between the ages of 21 and 25 years. The largest part of the sample was single (48.6 percent), with a high school education (65.7 percent). One particularly noteworthy point is that 42.9 percent of the sample population had a tattoo or brand with specific gang significance. Further, almost half of the inmates (48.6 percent) had between one and three years of active-duty service at the time of their incarceration. In Table 27, Hispanics are included in the "white" category.

Table 27. Interview Sample Demographics

Current Grade (Reduced)	Number Surveyed	Percent of Sample (N=35)
E-1	30	85.7
E-2	2	5.7
E-3	3	8.6
Total	35	100.0
Highest Grade Held		
E-1	1	2.9
E-2	9	25.7
E-3	14	40.0
E-4	7	20.0
E-5	3	8.5
E-6	1	2.9
Total	35	100.0

Table 27 (cont.)

Service	Number Surveyed	Percent of Sample (N=35)
U.S. Navy	12	34.3
U.S. Marine Corps	23	65.7
Total	35	100.0
Race		
White	14	40.0
Black	19	54.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	5.7
Total	35	100.0
Age		
18-20	7	20.0
21-25	18	51.4
26-30	8	22.9
31-35	2	5.7
Total	35	100.0
Marital Status		
Single	17	48.6
Married	11	31.4
Divorced	7	20.0
Total	35	100.0
Education Level		
GED	3	8.6
High School	23	65.7
Some College/No Degree	9	25.7
Total	35	100.0

Table 27 (cont.)

Identification Marks	Number Surveyed	Percent of Sample (N=35)
Tattoos/No Gang Significance	9	25.7
Tattoos With Gang Significance	15	42.9
No Tattoos	11	31.4
Total	35	100.0
Total Service Time		
6 Months - 1 Year	1	2.8
1-3 Years	17	48.6
3-5 Years	11	31.4
5-7 Years	3	8.6
7+ Years	3	8.6
Total	35	100.0

C. MAJOR THEMES

The following major themes were derived from focused interviews with the subjects. Excerpts from selected interviews are presented to illustrate each theme.

1. A High Percentage of Inmates Were Suspended or Expelled from School

A relatively high proportion (45.7 percent) of the interviewees had been expelled for deviant behavior from grade school or high school. Another 14.3 percent were suspended from school, although not expelled. One individual described his behavior as follows:

> I got expelled for causing trouble all the time. I eventually dropped out because I didn't like the teachers. I got my GED, though.

Another former Navy man stated that he was expelled, and had numerous behavior problems while growing up:

> I got into a lot of trouble as a child. I was told I was hyper-active and that I had a learning disability. I also saw a psychiatrist from kindergarten until about 7th grade. I failed a grade in school, and I was expelled for behavior problems. I then went to a special school, but I got expelled from there, too.

This can be one of the first visible signs of childhood patterns of misconduct. These individuals are more likely to become involved in other types of juvenile delinquent behavior, especially when they are expelled, with nothing but extra time on their hands. This number is comparable to the Navy brig data in Table 8, which shows that 39.1 percent of the sample of inmates had at one time been expelled from school.

2. A Significant Percentage of Inmates Were Incarcerated for Violent Crimes

Of the 35 individuals in the sample, 12 (34.3 percent) were convicted of violent crimes against other persons. One man described his crime as follows:

> My partner punched this dude two or three times in the head. He told him, "take off your shoes, give me the jacket, I want your watch, your rings, how much money you got." The dude did everything he said, then the guy started to run. My partner told him to sit down on the ground and he kicked him in the head a bunch of times. Then my partner hit him in the head with a rock about 15 times, hit him with his closed fist in the face, choked him, stomped him, and we picked the dude up and threw him in the river, but he was still moaning, so my crime partner started dropping four or five 20 or 30 pound rocks on his head. He was still alive when we left him. A fisherman caught him a couple of days later in his net.

Another Marine was convicted of a significantly violent crime. He stated:

> I had a lot of stress in the Marine Corps at the time, and I was extremely frustrated. I was watching my 3-year-old stepson one day and I was upset, so I shook him. I told everyone he fell. The baby had brain damage and lost consciousness. Then he died.

The charges against these individuals were generally for crimes of an extremely violent nature. Violent crimes included first degree and premeditated murder, unpremeditated murder, involuntary manslaughter, rape, sodomy, indecent assault, aggravated assault, and assault and battery.

The majority of the non-violent crimes included extensive unauthorized absence charges and the use and possession of various illicit drugs, including marijuana, crystal methamphetamines, and cocaine. Table 28 shows the

crystal methamphetamines, and cocaine. Table 28 shows the range of crimes committed by the sample of inmates interviewed and the respective sentences awarded.

Table 28. Crimes Committed and Sentences Awarded by General Courts Martial: Survey Sample (N=35)

Premeditated Murder Assault	Death
First Degree Murder Assault and Battery (6 counts) Conspiracy to Commit Murder	Life → 50 Years
Rape Indecent Assault Larceny of a Motor Vehicle Weapons Possession	49 Years
Unpremeditated Murder Conspiracy to Commit Murder	Pre-trial: Life Awarded: 30 Years
Rape Indecent Assault Carnal Knowledge of a Minor Disobeying a Lawful Order	30 Years
Robbery Conspiracy to Commit Robbery Unauthorized Absence (4 months)	20 Years
Larceny by Force Forgery Possession with Intent to Distribute (Cocaine) Use of Marijuana Possession of Stolen Property	15 Years
Rape Sodomy	15 Years
Involuntary Manslaughter False Official Statement	13 Years
Sodomy Indecent Assault	10 Years
Assault Receiving Stolen Property Worthless Make: Bad Checks (< $1,000) Disobeying a Lawful Order	9 Years

Table 28 (cont.)

Exposure to a Minor Outstanding Debt (< $1,000)	7 Years
Larceny Possession of a Controlled Substance (Marijuana) Falsifying ID Cards Forgery: TAD Orders Disobeying a Lawful Order Disrespect	5 Years
Wrongful Use and Distribution of Narcotics (Crystal Meth, Marijuana) Conspiracy to Distribute Communicating a Threat to an NCO	5 years
Use, Possession, and/or Transportation of Narcotics (Marijuana, Crystal Meth, and Cocaine)	5 Years
Conspiracy Counterfeiting Carrying a Concealed Weapon False Official Statement Unauthorized Absence (3 Days)	4 ½ Years
Aggravated Assault Disobeying a Lawful Order Communication of a Threat Carrying a Concealed Weapon	4 Years
Conspiracy Larceny and Wrongful Appropriation Forgery Burglary Obstructing Justice Unauthorized Absence	4 Years
Use of Crystal Methamphetamines Distribution (2 counts)	3 Years
Wrongful Possession (Cocaine, LSD, and Marijuana) Use and Distribution International Trafficking	2 Years

Table 28 (cont.)

Attempts Conspiracy Desertion Missing Ships Movement Wrongful Use of Marijuana Simple Battery Receiving Currency for Arranging for Sexual Intercourse/Sodomy Arranging for Sexual Intercourse/Sodomy Resisting Apprehension	18 Months
Larceny of nonmilitary Property (<$100) Attempted Larceny Use of Cocaine	15 Months
Distribution and Possession (Cocaine and Crystal Meth) Escape from Custody Resisting Apprehension Unauthorized Absence < 30 Days Breaking Arrest	15 Months
Larceny Forgery Fraud	9 Months
Forgery Worthless Make: Bad Checks	5 Months
Unauthorized Absence (4 months)	113 Days
Missing Ships Movement Unauthorized Absence (3 months)	90 Days
Unauthorized Absence > 30 Days	45 Days
Simple Assault Communicating a Threat Drunk and Disorderly	30 Days
Desertion: Terminate by Apprehension	30 Days
Distribution and Usage of Marijuana	29 Days
Forgery: Making/Altering Failure to Obey Lawful Order Solicit to Commit Offense Fraud	Pre-trial

Table 28 (cont.)

Possession and Use of Marijuana Unauthorized Absence < 3 Days Failure to Obey Lawful Order	Pre-trial
Missing Movement: Neglect Unauthorized Absence > 30 Days	Pre-trial
Desertion: Avoid Duty	Pre-trial

3. Almost One-third of Inmates Had Been Fired from a Previous Job

The interviewer's sample closely reflected the Navy brig data (Table 10) in that about one-third of the incarcerated, self-admitted gang members had been fired from a job prior to military service. One inmate freely admitted that he was "no angel" while at work:

> I was fired for confronting the manager several times, and for stealing from work.

Another individual indicated that he had an unsuccessful work history:

> I had about six or seven jobs while I was in high school. I was fired once for not showing up to work. It didn't matter, when I was young I was a "bad boy" most of the time, until I got to be a freshman. I was ditching school, not listening to my mother, and mouthing-off. I was never violent, just disobedient. In the end I graduated, though.

4. Most Inmates Came From Single-Parent Homes

The majority of the sample spent most of their early years with only one parent, usually a single mother (51 percent). About 43 percent of the interviewees grew up in a two-parent household. A two-parent household included various combinations of both natural parents, or one natural parent and one stepparent. Only 6 percent of the individuals lived with some other relative, including a grandmother, an aunt, or an uncle. One inmate described his household as follows:

> I lived with my mother and two sisters. My mother and father were divorced. My mother had several boyfriends and husbands. I couldn't even begin to count, probably around 30. I don't know. We moved around a lot, because my mother couldn't pay the bills.

Another individual, who grew up in California, described his home life:

> We lived in a low-income neighborhood. My mom was a single mother with ten children. I can't remember when my father left.

5. Almost Half of the Inmates Came From an Abusive Family Environment

Just under half of the interviewees reported that they had been abused as a juvenile, either by a family or non-

family member. This included physical, emotional, and sexual abuse. Of those who reported being abused, 7 (41.1 percent) reported that they were abused by a family member who was either drug- or alcohol-dependent. One former Marine told how he was repeatedly physically and emotionally abused:

> I lived with my father until about age 13, in a house with my grandmother, my uncles, my sisters, and lots of cousins. Then I went to live with my mother. My mother is very strict. She used to beat me with a switch off of a tree, a belt, or an extension cord. I have two scars on my back from the extension cords. My father had an alcohol problem, and my aunt was in alcohol rehab. I went to live with my mother because my father was also a crack abuser and he was going through drug rehab.

Another subject discussed his abusive environment as one where he was repeatedly abused by his mother's boyfriends:

> My mother was never home. I consider her a whore. She used to beat me with the belt, and every now and then my mother's boyfriends tried to assume that father role model type thing, and they would abuse, I guess try to discipline, me, physically. My mother was an alcoholic. She lived in a bar.

6. Many Inmates Concealed Their Arrest Histories or Other Criminal Activity at the Time of Enlistment

Over half of the interviewees (19 of 35) admitted that they had prior arrests, convictions, or spent time in

juvenile hall. Of those who admitted to having a criminal history, about half (9 of 19) stated that their juvenile records were sealed and that their recruiters had no access to them. One former Marine described his criminal involvement with his gang as follows:

> My gang was mostly people from my neighborhood, kinda like a "clique." Mostly, we dealt drugs, that was our primary reason, to make money. I was involved in drive-bys and I carried a weapon, too. I was arrested two times for shoplifting and drug use, but I don't have any juvenile convictions.

A young, black male proudly described his juvenile activities:

> I was lucky that I was always able to evade the police. I only had one confrontation with the law. I was "set up" at work, but I was innocent. The charge was larceny, under $200.00.

Other individuals were extremely glib about the fact that they gained assistance or were encouraged by a recruiter to conceal past affiliations with a gang. In two cases, recruiters did not ask them about their gang affiliations, and the individuals did not offer the information.

In four separate instances, the recruiters encouraged prospective enlistees to lie about their gang affiliations; in another case, the recruiter gave the enlistment candidate some herbal tea, which he claimed would "cleanse some of the

marijuana from your system" before reporting to the MEPS; in two specific cases, the recruiter actually spoke to a judge on behalf of the individuals; and, in one case, a judge gave the individual an ultimatum: go to jail or join the military.

Of those inmates who did not have an arrest history at the time of their enlistment, many admitted that they were involved in extensive criminal activity, and took pride in their "clean record" and their cleverness in avoiding law enforcement officials. For example, a former Marine E-2 described his juvenile activities as follows:

> We used to be involved in selling and using drugs, mostly weed and cocaine, drive-bys, and fighting. We also used to be packin' when we were in the wrong neighborhood. I didn't tell my recruiter about my gang affiliation. It was none of his business. I only needed a drug waiver.

7. The Majority of Inmates Had a Non-Judicial Punishment (NJP) in their Record

A significant pattern of prior misconduct was revealed by the interviewees: three out of four (74.3 percent) admitted to having at least one NJP. Of those with an NJP, almost half (46.2 percent) stated they had just one such punishment; and 15.4 percent said they had at least three

previous NJP charges. Many of the previous NJPs consisted of unauthorized absence charges, as one inmate indicated:

> My ties to my family are far stronger than my ties to the military. I went UA the first time because my 19-year-old sister was gang-raped, and I wanted to get the guys who did it.

Additionally, four of the interviewees had a previous Summary or Special Court Martial in their record. As one subject, who had been to a prior Special Court Martial, explained:

> Several people from my command popped positive on drugs after attending a party at my house, but I didn't. I went to a Special Court Martial for distributing or aiding and possession of marijuana; I was found innocent of all charges. They got nothin' on me. But you know what, I'm a money hungry person, and the government is about the easiest thing in the world to scam. I never make the same mistake twice.

8. The Majority of Incarceration Crimes are Not Gang-Related

Only five interviewees committed a crime (for which they were incarcerated) that could be considered gang-related. Three of the five crimes involved more than one perpetrator. These "affiliations" were reflected through conviction on conspiracy charges.

One former gang member described his crime as a gang-execution, and indicated that he had called the "hit" on another gang-member, who was also on active-duty. This inmate directed two other military members who were "footsoldiers" in the gang to participate in the execution. This OG's (or original gangster's) crime partners are also currently incarcerated in the USDB, all of whom were charged with conspiracy. As he commented:

> I was the OG in the gang. We were there to represent the red rag. We killed him because he snitched on us. He ratted us out for stealing government property. He knew what he had coming. I stabbed him twice, my crime partner stabbed him two more times, and the other guy stabbed him about ten more times.

In very few cases is there a direct relationship between having been a member of a gang and the particular crime associated with incarceration; however, the few crimes that were gang-related were also extremely violent in nature.

9. Most Individuals Joined Gangs Prior to Enlistment

The vast majority (33 of 35) of the interviewees indicated that they were gang members prior to enlistment. There were only two individuals who indicated that they were actually "jumped in" a gang (that is, beaten by all the

members in the gang as a condition for membership) after enlistment in the Navy or Marine Corps. Most indicated that they were using the military as a means to a better life, and they indicated that they were mostly successful in leaving their gang affiliation in the past. One man who became affiliated with a gang after enlistment described how it happened:

> I started hanging out with a couple of other individuals in my unit, and they started telling me about their gang. After I was around these individuals for so long, I started to take on their attitude. I liked what they stood for and I wanted to become a member. They loaned me their cars, they provided me a house to stay in off-base, and took me on trips. I wanted to get stuff that a lot of people couldn't have, and to get respect. The guy that introduced me had everything, video games and a car.

The one other interviewee who stated that he joined a gang after enlistment explained that his active-duty friends were in the gang, and he was introduced to the lifestyle by them. As he explained:

> I was "jumped in" with the Crips after joining the Marine Corps and beaten-down. I wasn't involved in any illegal activity with the Crips at first, but I felt like I wasn't making enough money in the Marine Corps, so I was doing "stupid stuff," you know, using and selling drugs, mostly marijuana, some coke, and I carried a handgun under the seat of the car. I decided to start selling drugs and rebelling because I got written-up for being a few minutes late to work, and the Marine Corps didn't show me any love back.

10. The Majority of Inmates Had Required Moral Waivers For Enlistment Eligibility

Just over half of the interviewees (18 of 35) required some type of moral waiver to qualify for enlistment. The majority of the waivers were issued for drugs and prior arrest records. One individual described his extensive illegal involvement and the reasons he required a moral waiver:

> I've been involved in everything, sales and use of drugs, larceny, burglary, robbery, and drive-bys. I've seen people murdered. I've shot at people, but never killed anyone. My big thing was selling weed or transferring guns. My rank was 2-star General at the age of 16, and it was based on "doin' the most dirt," so I had numerous run-ins with the police. I was arrested three times for weapons possession of a .38mm, and underage drinking; disturbing the peace, and underage drinking; and carrying a concealed weapon. I was on probation for a year before I went to boot camp. I never told the recruiter about my gang affiliation, but I had to get a waiver for drugs, and a waiver for the concealed weapons charge.

Interestingly enough, of the 17 interviewees who did not require a moral waiver for enlistment, 14 bragged about having never been caught participating in an illegal activity, or admitted that they had blatantly lied about past gang affiliations to recruiters. One man stated that he was involved in extensive illegal activity prior to enlistment but never got caught, and, thus, he did not require a moral waiver for enlistment. He elaborated:

> The gang is like any other business. It's all about money. Because the police are against us, that's why we become violent. It's easy money when you don't even have enough money to buy food, living in a rat-infested apartment, it's awfully hard to turn down $1,500.00 for dropping off a package. I didn't have to get "jumped in" because I knew the right people. The biggest test was to show loyalty when somethin' went down. I didn't need a waiver. I denied any gang associations when the recruiter asked me, but I tried to enlist in the Army first, and they said I'd have to wait a year, so I decided to join the Marine Corps.

Another man thought it was "cool" that he had been involved in illicit activity while on active-duty for which he was never caught:

> There were at least 20 other active-duty individuals from my company involved in my gang. Most of our gang activity involved check scams, drugs, robbery, and stolen cars. When we got "jumped in" we were required to "do work" for the gang. That meant we had to do whatever needed to be done. We all had rank and we were working for an OG who was in prison.

11. Most Inmates Had Joined the Military to Better their Life Circumstances

The following Table shows the reasons stated by the interviewees for joining the military.

Table 29. Reasons For Joining the Military: Survey Sample (N=35)

Reason	Frequency	Percent
Better life/get out of current environment	13	37.1
Thought I would die or go to jail	8	22.9
Providing for family	4	11.4
Gain job experience	2	5.7
Educational benefits	2	5.7
Independence	1	2.9
Liked what military stands for	1	2.9
Rebel against parents	1	2.9
Travel	1	2.9
"Jail or military service ultimatum"	1	2.9
To be a "legal killer"	1	2.9
Total	35	100.0

One individual described his reasons for joining the Marine Corps as follows:

> I joined the Marine Corps because my father was in the Marine Corps and there was a long family history of military service. Mostly it was to impress my family, to show them that I could do what they couldn't do. Besides, I realized I might go to jail or die if I didn't, after that guy got shot, and my cousin is in jail because he murdered my best friend in San Antonio.

Another interviewee and former sailor gave his explanation for why he joined the service:

> I've seen it all and I wanted to escape from there, get away from that kind of lifestyle, and to better my life.

One former Marine described his motivation for joining as follows:

> I joined the Marine Corps because there was nothing else going on in my life. I wanted to get away before I got hurt or killed or in more trouble.

Another former Marine stated his primary motivating factors for joining the military:

> I joined the Marine Corps because I wanted to be like my stepfather. I idolized him. He was the representation of everything that a man was. The Marine Corps is a good place to change your life, and I was refusing to grow up. I wanted to step up to the plate.

One interviewee provided the following explanation for his enlistment in the U.S. Navy:

> I probably would've wound up killing somebody if I didn't join the military. I didn't like the life. I felt trapped, plus I'd just seen my cousin get locked up. I didn't have anything else to do, and I had a few friends in the military, even though they didn't achieve anything, so I might as well enlist.

12. Many Inmates Had Family Members in Gangs or in Prison as a Result of Gang Affiliation

Several interviewees reported that their families were extensively involved in gang activity. This most often included fathers, brothers, cousins, and sisters. Results showed that about one-fourth of the interviewees (9 of 35) had family members in gangs; and over half (5 of 9) were currently incarcerated for gang-related crimes. One individual described his family's involvement in gangs as follows:

> There were a lot of gangs in my neighborhood. I saw a lot of fights, drive-bys, stabbings, and murders. One of my cousins is serving a triple-life sentence for murdering five people in various cities across the country for the gang. Every male in my family has been in prison except for my son and my nephew. My father wants to kill me when I get out of here [jail].

Another former gang member described his family's ties to the gang:

> It was based on ethnicity. I grew up in that environment and joining the gang was automatic. Lots of my relatives were in the gang, it was kind of like a rite of passage for me.

The interviews tended to support the finding that individuals who have family members in gangs are more likely to become involved in gangs themselves as juveniles. Many

interviewees described it as somehow "evolutionary," and said they did not make a conscious decision to join a gang; rather, they were brought up with the belief that membership was inevitable. In some cases, membership represented a rite of passage into manhood for the individual.

13. The Inmates Joined Gangs Because of Friends, Family, and Making Money

Table 29 shows the reasons given by the interviewees for joining gangs.

Table 30. Reasons For Joining Gangs: Survey Sample (N=35)

Reason	Frequency	Percent
Friends in gang	8	22.9
Make money	7	20.0
Acceptance/ popularity	7	20.0
Grew up in neighborhood	5	14.3
Family in gang	4	11.4
Protection	1	2.9
No reason given	3	8.5
Total	35	100.0

Several interviewees indicated that their primary reason for joining a gang was because their friends were gang members. The following are typical statements:

> I joined for acceptance and friendship. I was about age 14 or 15.
>
> I joined the Vice Lords because most of my relatives were in the gang. My father and my uncles were members of the Black Peacestones, but I joined because of my friends.
>
> I joined to be popular.
>
> I joined because I am half black/half white. I took crap from everybody. All of my friends were the outcasts of the neighborhood, so we had our own gang.

The categories of "friends in a gang" and "acceptance/popularity" are considered somewhat similar. Nevertheless, Table 29 attempts to list each category as specifically stated by the interviewee.

In the next chapter, current Navy and Marine Corps polices and procedures are discussed as they relate to gang and extremist group members in the military.

IV. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS POLICY AND PROCEDURES

A. CURRENT IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

How can the Navy and Marine Corps best minimize the negative consequences of having gang and extremist group members on active-duty? The first line of defense is to identify active and passive gang and extremist group members prior to enlistment. There are four stages when applicants could be screened to determine possible involvement in gangs or extremist groups. (Arabian, 1997)

The first contact of an applicant with the military is typically with a recruiter. Recruiters can pose questions regarding qualifications, to include discussion of police involvement or previous criminal history. Tattoos or gang/hate-group identifiers can be uncovered at this stage.

Medical screening may be the next point of contact between the applicant and the military. Self-disclosure may be made of family problems, psychological history, drug or alcohol usage, or other personal difficulties. The physical examination may reveal indications of gang, hate-group, or extremist group affiliation through tattoos, brands, or other markings. If questionable markings or attitudes are revealed at this stage, a psychiatric consultation could be

required at the physician's discretion. An applicant can be found medically disqualified for a questionable tattoo or they can be referred back to the recruiter for further review of eligibility. In the Marine Corps, the mere presence of a tattoo can be cause for disqualification.

The background screening process is the next stage. A pre-enlistment interview, fingerprinting, and submission of the Entrance National Agency Check (ENTNAC) occurs at this point. The program in which an applicant is about to enlist is explained. Applicants are then questioned as to the completeness and correctness of the information they have provided. The interview or specific responses on the Questionnaire for National Security Positions, may indicate active participation in a high-risk activity, and should be noted at this time.

The enlistment phase from the Delayed Entry Program up until movement to the initial training site is the last opportunity to screen out individuals before commencement of active-duty. An additional physical examination and interview are conducted in which membership in questionable groups may be detected.

The issue of active versus passive membership is another contentious point. In the Army, for example, an applicant would only be denied enlistment if his or her

affiliations are considered active; in contrast, in the Marine Corps, enlistment can be denied solely on the presence of specific tattoos or brands, which may only be considered "passive" behavior by the Army. In the Navy, it must be determined that an individual's activities would be detrimental to service in order to be considered a disqualifier. This is the most difficult task. Each service differs in its interpretation of DOD Regulation 1325.6, which is discussed below.

B. CURRENT DIRECTIVES

Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 1325.6, "Guidelines for Handling Dissident and Protest Activities Among Members of the Armed Forces," was initially issued on 12 September 1969; its one update was issued twenty-seven years later on 1 October 1996. As stated in the update:

> This directive applies to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Military Departments (including the Coast Guard when it is operating as a Military Service in the Navy), the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Combatant Commands, the defense Agencies, and the DOD Field Activities. The term 'Military Services,' as used herein, refers to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. (U.S. Department of Defense, 1996, 3.5.8)
>
> The directive provides the following mandates:
>
> 3.1 The Department of Defense shall safeguard the security of the United States.

> 3.2 The Service members' right of expression should be preserved to the maximum extent possible, consistent with good order and discipline and the national security.
>
> 3.3 No commander should be indifferent to conduct that, if allowed to proceed unchecked, would destroy the effectiveness of his or her unit.
>
> 3.4 The proper balancing of these interests will depend largely upon the calm and prudent judgment of the responsible commander.

Section 3.5 of the directive provides guidelines for addressing situations where service members are involved in activities such as:

> (1) possession or distribution of printed material, [where the commander deems] there is a clear danger to the loyalty, discipline, or morale of military personnel, or if the distribution of the publication would materially interfere with the accomplishment of a military mission; (2) [frequenting] off-post gathering places, [including] "off-limits" establishments when the activities taking place there include counseling members to refuse to perform duty or to desert; pose a significant adverse effect on service members' health, morale, or welfare; or otherwise present a clear danger to the loyalty, discipline, or morale of a member or military unit; (3) [belonging to] servicemen organizations, as commanders are not authorized to recognize or to bargain with any union representing or seeking recognition to represent service members; (4) publication of "underground newspapers," [in that] while publication of "underground newspapers" by military personnel off-post, on their own time, and with their own money and equipment, is not prohibited, if such a publication contains language the utterance of which is punishable under Federal law, those involved in the printing, publication or distribution may be disciplined for such infractions; (5) [supporting] on-post

> demonstrations and similar activities, [in that] commanders shall prohibit any demonstration or activity on the installation or facility that could result in interference with, or prevention of, orderly accomplishment of the mission of the installation or facility, or present a clear danger to the loyalty, discipline or morale of the troops; (6) [supporting] off-post demonstrations by members, [in that] members of the Armed Forces are prohibited from participating in off-post demonstrations when they are on-duty, in a foreign country, when their activities constitute a breach of law and order, when violence is likely to result, or when they are in uniform in violation of DOD Directive 1334.1, "Wearing of the Uniform," August 11, 1969; (7) [when filing] grievances, [in that] the right of members to complain and request redress of grievances against actions of their commanders is protected by Article 138 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice; and (8) [when participating in] "prohibited activities," [as defined previously in this thesis in Chapter 1.] (U.S. Department of Defense, 1996, 3.5.8)

DOD Directive 1325.6 addresses active participation, but does not draw a clear distinction between active and passive participation. Army Regulation(AR) 600-20, "Army Command Policies and Procedures," mirrors the DOD Directive but goes one critical step farther by providing a differentiation between active and passive participation. It states that actively participating in extremist organizations is clearly prohibited. Passive participation is, thus, defined as being a member, getting information through the mail, or attending an event; all of which are "strongly discouraged as incompatible with military

service"; but, under Army policy, these activities are not prohibited. (U.S. Department of the Army, 1988, chap. 4-12)

The Army's policy further delineates actions that the commander can take to "limit soldiers' participation" in extremist groups. Among those listed, when the commander is made aware that his or her soldiers are members of, or are affiliated with extremist groups, the commander should ensure that the individual is educated regarding the Army's "fair and equitable treatment for all" policy. Commanders should advise and counsel their soldiers that, if personal opinions are inconsistent with Army core values, the soldier should "seriously reconsider their position." (U.S. Department of the Army, 1988, chap. 4-12)

The Navy and Marine Corps do not have such an established directive. What the Navy does have, is the Naval Criminal Investigative Service Gang Information Handbook, which provides comprehensive data concerning tattoos that may be considered disqualifying for potential enlistees and should be utilized to its fullest at all Naval Recruiting Districts (NRDs). This reference may aid in the identification of individuals who are actively involved in gang or extremist-group activities.

The Marine Corps has recently become more active in the area. In All Marine (ALMAR) 194/96, recruiters are directed

to take an especially close look at applicants with respect to tattoos that may be disqualifying. Marine Corps Recruiting Command (MCRC) Frost Call 026-96, dated June 1996, states that:

> It is in the best interest of the Marine Corps to evaluate each applicant with regard to any tattoos or brands when determining enlistment eligibility. This is paramount due to the growing number of organizations that exist with allegiances that supersede that of national defense. Recruiters need to be cognizant that different types of tattoos and brands may disqualify applicants for enlistment.

Further policy clarification is also included in MCRC Frost Call 026-96. These are as follows:

> (1) Prohibited Areas: tattoos or brands on the head or neck are strictly prohibited; (2) Prejudicial to Good Order and Discipline: in other areas of the body, tattoos or brands that are sexist, excessive, racist or eccentric in nature are prohibited. Commanders are responsible for identifying and denying enlistment to applicants falling into this category. Clarification of questionable tattoos should be referred to higher headquarters; and (3) Gang or Extremist Group Related: any person who has a tattoo, regardless of location on their body, will not be further processed if the tattoo depicts vulgar or anti-American matter, brings possible discredit to the Marine Corps, or associates an applicant with an extremist group organization; tattoos or brands relating to gang membership or gang activities must be researched and commented on before enlistment; local law enforcement authorities can provide information and should be utilized if questions arise.

Further direction came in a memorandum (1100, RE, 20 August 1996) from the Commanding General, Marine Corps Recruiting Command to Distribution, providing additional clarification of policy. As stated here:

> Having a tattoo does not necessarily disqualify an applicant, but should be a catalyst for a more intensive screening and interview process. The enclosures and locally procured information should be used to determine the extent and meaning of the applicant's tattoos. If this process reveals gang/hate group related activities on the part of an applicant, the applicant will be disqualified. If the applicant's tattoos or his conduct are questionable, the application must be referred to the Recruiting Station (RS).
>
> If a determination cannot be made at the RS level, waiver request with photos of the tattoo and an explanation as to why the individual bears the tattoo will be forwarded to the next higher echelon of the chain of command for review.

Annual in-depth review of Navy and Marine Corps policies and continued awareness training will allow for improved screening and enlistment of individuals who have a high chance for successful assimilation and acculturation into military service.

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of this thesis is as follows: (1) to gather and analyze information concerning assimilation into military service by persons who have belonged to gangs or extremist groups and who were incarcerated in a military correctional facility; (2) to examine quantitative data on characteristics of the total population of self-admitted gang members who have been incarcerated in Navy brigs; and (3) to review possible changes in policies concerning the recruitment and screening of persons who have been affiliated with gangs or extremist groups. Although the interview portion of the study included a limited sample of 35 inmates, several key findings emerged.

First, the study shows that there are both former and current gang members in the Navy and Marine Corps. Information was obtained from the Navy's Corrections Management Information System (CORMIS) database, which contains life history information on all personnel entering Navy brigs. This included a sample of 4,825 prisoners, including 460 (or 9.5 percent) who admitted to gang membership.

Second, the results of the study reveal that gang members are not easily identified prior to enlistment or once in the military. In many cases, applicants admitted that they had blatantly lied to their recruiters concerning their past affiliations and activities. Individuals who are incarcerated exhibited a lack of acculturation into military service; and the study suggests that a high percentage of these individuals had some type of criminal involvement prior to enlistment. The military also had difficulty uncovering much of this information during the screening process based on the fact that a significant portion of the information is self-reported.

Third, in addition to false information provided by applicants, there are some recruiters who appear to be less than honest in their practices. The results show that, in some cases, recruiters are not only counseling applicants as to what to admit during pre-screening interviews, but they are also encouraging individuals not to divulge specific negative background information. One explanation for this is the fact that performance marks, and, thus, rewards, including promotion, are based on meeting enlistment quotas for recruiters. Because of this, there will be some recruiters who are more likely to "turn a blind eye" to derogatory past histories of applicants.

Fourth, most inmates joined gangs prior to enlistment. A significant portion were involved in gangs as juveniles. The pervasive scenario was enlistment for the purpose of changing one's life circumstances, and to leave the gang lifestyle behind. Interviewees stated that they were mostly successful in putting gang affiliations in the past.

A fifth noteworthy finding is that a high proportion of interviewees committed crimes that were quite violent in nature; however, the majority of those interviewed were not convicted for crimes associated with gang membership.

A final point is that, overall, as a group, the sample population may have many observable characteristics that combine to "profile" or predict types of people who may have a problem adjusting to military life. Because many inmates had no previous juvenile records, however, it is extremely difficult to predict a future lack of assimilation. Nevertheless, this group, for the most part, had numerous and significant personal problems that they brought with them into service.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is clear that the problems associated with gang and extremist group members in the military can have potentially serious consequences. Although this thesis does not provide

a major policy analysis, a number of findings suggest the need to review current procedures for identifying and screening applicants for military enlistment who have previous or active affiliations with a gang or extremist group. Specifically, the Navy and Marine Corps may wish to study the following areas: (1) the feasibility of gaining access to juvenile arrest records which may signal a need for more intensive background investigation; (2) the effectiveness of current procedures for granting moral waivers; (3) the conscientiousness of recruiters in revealing information on applicants with potential problems, and the various pressures on recruiters to possibly conceal important background histories; (4) the development of screening policies and procedures directed at better identifying persons with a history of activity with a gang or extremist group; and (5) improved clarification and elaboration of policies and procedures pertaining to gang and extremist group activities among active-duty Navy and Marine Corps personnel.

Further research should be conducted regarding gangs and extremist groups and their impact on the military. A solid foundation of empirical research needs to be established before procedures are changed or new policies are implemented. The following list includes specific areas

of research that could be explored further: (1) the acculturation of self-admitted gang and extremist group members in the Navy and Marine Corps who are not incarcerated; (2) the number and nature of administrative unsuitability discharges related to gang activity that were given, prior to incarceration; and (3) an in-depth study of recruiting practices. With this information in hand, the Navy and Marine Corps would be better prepared to effectively control a problem that has just recently become recognized but may very well intensify as the years progress.

LIST OF REFERENCES

A & E Investigative Reports, Gangs in the Military, 1998, 1 February.

Anderson, Edwin W. 1996. Right-wing Extremism in America and Its Implications for the U.S. Army. Alabama: Air War College University.

Arabian, Jane. 1997. Information Paper on Applicant Screening. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Force Management Policy, Military Manpower Policy, Accession Policy, 697-9271. Photocopied.

Associated Press. 1996. Marine Charged in Shooting of Officers.

Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 64 (1976); see also NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Bynum, Jack E. & Thompson, William E. 1996. Juvenile Delinquency: A Sociological Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

DeJonge v. Oregon, 299 U.S. 353, 365 (1937).

Egan, Timothy. 1994. Military Base Jarred by Specter of Gang Killings. *Special to the New York Times.*

Guralink, David, ed. 1983. *Webster's New World Dictionary.* New York: Warner Books Printing.

McClure, Peggy. 1997. Gangs and Youth Violence in Military Communities. *Military Family Issues: The Research Digest, 1,* no. 3, 6-9.

Payne, Chris. 1994. Gang Members Using Military to Train for Crime, Police Fear. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram,* 1.

Pell v. Procunier, 417 U.S. 817, 822 (1974); see also Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987).

Philpott, Tom. 1997. The Wrong Stuff. *The Washingtonian Magazine,* October.

Report of the Army's Task Force on Extremist Activities to the Secretary of the Army. 1996. Washington: Author.

Roberts v. United States Jaycees, 468 U.S. 609, 618 (1984).

Schwartz, Alan M. ed. 1996. *Danger: Extremism--The Major Vehicles and Voices on America's Far-Right Fringe.* New York: Anti-Defamation League.

U.S. Congress. House. National Security Committee. 1996. *Extremist Activity in the Navy and Marine Corps*: Hearing before the National Security Committee, 25 June.

U.S. Congress. House. Armed Services Committee. 1994. *An Assessment of Racial Discrimination in the Military: A Global Perspective.* Report prepared by Ronald V. Dellums, Chairman, 103d Cong., 2nd sess., 1994. Committee Print 8.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. (1998). Military Recruiting and Retention: Hearing Before the Personnel Subcommittee.

U.S. Department of the Army. 1988. Army Command Policies and Procedures: AR 600-20. Washington, D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Defense. 1996. Guidelines for Handling Dissident and Protest Activities Among Members of the Armed Forces; DOD Directive 1325.6. Washington, D.C.: Author.

United States Army Criminal Investigation Command, Intelligence Division, Operations Directorate, 1992, Gang Information Handbook: An Overview of Gang Activity in the United States, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

Valetk, Harry. 1997. Defense Department Study of Gang Members in the Military. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary of Defense. Photocopied.

APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW SUMMARIES

SUBJECT 1

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject was born in the state of California. His parents divorced when he was four. When he was five, his father was incarcerated for robbery. At that point, subject went to live with his grandmother because he claimed his mother was a little "messed up." Subject became loosely affiliated with a gang at the age of 8 with a bunch of other "youngsters." The gang was recognized by the color blue and specific hand signs. At age thirteen, subject relocated to the East Coast because his stepfather wanted him to get away from his home town where he was starting to get into trouble. After relocation, subject graduated from high school. Subsequently, he joined the Navy, and was ordered to San Diego for duty immediately following boot camp.

At age eighteen, subject actually became a gang member. His father and cousins were already members of the gang, therefore, subject was never "jumped in." He got a tattoo that symbolized that he would eventually be locked up and that he would always be in trouble. Tattoo was subject's name over a ring of barbed-wire around his bicep. Subject's father had "tatts" from his shoulders to his wrists and all over his back and chest. Many of his friends are currently

incarcerated, two for life sentences. One conviction was for gang-related murder, on a "third strike" conviction. Another family member was incarcerated for five years on a car-jacking charge. Subject had no prior arrests or convictions, but was suspended from school a number of times for "ditching."

Subject was employed in at least 10 jobs while in high school, with a poor rate of success. He was fired on numerous occasions for stealing, not showing up, and generally poor work performance.

Subject stated he ultimately joined the Navy to use as a stepping stone to become a police officer, and he spent two months in the Delayed Entry Program (DEP). Subject said he did not admit to anything the recruiter didn't ask about directly. After approximately 3 years on active-duty, he went on Unauthorized Absence (UA) for a period of seven days. At that time, he informed the command that he was a gang member and that he was using drugs. A urinalysis test was negative, although subject still indicated that he had a problem. His voluntary statements were entered into his record. He then went to Commanding Officers' (CO's) Mast for the UA charge and was given 21 days restriction and a suspended reduction-in-rate. Subject had one previous Non-Judicial Punishment (NJP) for hazing in "A" School.

Another incident while subject was on active-duty was recorded with the local police department. He was stopped while driving a vehicle and all occupants' names were recorded; they were informed that if they were ever caught together again, a gang-crime report would be filed.

Approximately 4 months after his drug use admission, subject tested positive for crystal methamphetamines on a command urinalysis test, and was scheduled to commence Level III drug treatment immediately following 45 days of restriction. He stated that while awaiting Level III treatment to begin, he missed one day of work and never went back.

After almost 4 years on active-duty, member was charged and convicted of desertion to avoid duty. At the time of the interview, subject was still in a pre-trial status.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject stated the reasons he went on unauthorized absence:

> My ties to my family are far stronger than my ties to the military. The reason I went UA the first time was because my 19-year-old sister had been gang-raped, and I wanted to get the guys who did it. I know I was hanging out with the wrong crowd, but knowing everybody in the neighborhood felt good. Getting high and going out with my friends meant more to me than my career.

He indicated that he made a conscious decision to continue his affiliation with the gang and his cousins, even though it was inconsistent with his personal goal of attending college. He stated:

> I feel lost. I had a goal and now it's gone. I'm a little bit confused and upset thinking about what I could've done.

While on active-duty, subject felt he was a good sailor:

> I loved the Navy. I was selected as Junior Sailor of the Quarter at my first command, and I got 4.0 evaluations. I was also voted Hard Charger of the Month within my division.

Subject stated that there are many individuals looking for a way to sever their gang ties who speak to him seriously about joining the military. Although, in many cases, the individuals are ineligible for enlistment due to non-high school diploma status, or prior disqualifying juvenile records.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

Subject expressed incredulity and lack of understanding as to why he hung around the gang and why he chose to participate in illegal activity. However, subject realizes there is a punishment to be faced for his criminal involvement. He displayed some anger as he realizes he

could have made decisions to change his life circumstances. He easily succumbed to peer pressure, and he has low self-esteem.

Subject is unsure at this point whether his mother knows he is incarcerated. He has not spoken to her in over six months. He indicated that he is afraid to talk to her because he is disappointed in himself. He also regrets the situation he has created for himself.

In this case, subject may have been an active participant in a self-fulfilling prophecy. His expectation of what would happen if he returned to his hometown led to a pattern of behavior which resulted in confirmation of the expectancy. This subject may have rationalized his behavior through diffusion of responsibility, where his personal accountability for illegal activity was lessened through the inclusion of others within the group.

SUBJECT 2

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject became involved in gang activity in 6th grade, about the age of 12 while living in California. Subject resided with his mother and older sister throughout his primary years. As he entered 8th grade, subject was relocated to reside with his grandparents. Gang affiliation started as just "hanging out" with friends. This group only included male residents of Hispanic origin in what the subject described as a low-class neighborhood.

It was never a conscious decision to join the gang, rather an eventuality, as his cousins and uncles were already active members. Every person was required to be "jumped in" prior to actual membership, in order to earn the right to wear blue or black bandannas and present themselves as members of the gang. Significant tattoos included the Grim Reaper wearing a crown and purple robe, which the subject wears. Gang members were involved in theft, illicit drug trafficking and use, tagging (graffiti), fighting and "ditching school," although subject was never arrested for participation in these activities.

Subject worked at numerous fast-food restaurants while attending school. He then started selling drugs and stealing, and turning over stolen property to increase his

monetary income. Subject stated that while in the gang, he witnessed individuals being murdered, beaten-down, and stabbed. He said he witnessed participation in many violent activities against persons, although he only participated in property crimes and drug sales. Subject indicated his main reason for joining the military:

> I was motivated by the fact that my 14-year-old girlfriend was pregnant, and I realized the financial responsibilities I was gonna' have with my new family. When I turned 17, I decided the military would be a good place to better my family, and have steady pay.

At this point, subject started slowly disengaging himself from the gang and spending more time with his girlfriend. He stopped hanging out with the gang on a regular basis and he ceased participation in drug trafficking. Despite his immediate concerns about his family, subject managed to complete his high school education.

Subject's Navy performance was marked by one previous NJP for underage drinking. The crime that lead to his incarceration was an assault charge on another Navy enlisted person including a specification of brandishing a knife. He stated this was motivated by finding his wife in an adulterous relationship with this person, his best friend. Subject received a sentence of 30 days in prison.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject stated he was completely honest about his previous experiences with recruiters upon enlistment, as he had no prior arrests or convictions in his record. However, he did not admit to prior drug use and no moral waiver was required for enlistment. He talked about his interaction with his recruiter:

> The recruiter advised me that if I was questioned about drug use or gang affiliation at the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) to deny everything. I told the recruiter I've seen it all and I wanted to escape from there. I wanted to get away from that kind of lifestyle, and to better my life.

Subject discussed his first year-and-a-half on active-duty:

> The Navy was great. I amazed myself doing things I never thought I could do, such as use a computer and type. I think I did pretty good until I got into trouble. My lowest evaluation mark was like a 2.7 and I got up to like a 3.2. I feel kinda' stupid about what I did. I could've just let them do what they wanted and walked away, and started my life over again.

Subject stated his goals after release are to get a job, and to try and get custody of his daughter. He wants to go back to school, and his ultimate goal is to become an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT).

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

The subject expressed some regret for having married at age 16, as well as regret for allowing his life to evolve in the manner in which it did. However, he feels he is unjustly incarcerated because the member who had an affair with his wife went unpunished. Subject has a distorted view of his personal responsibility for his incarceration because he feels that someone else caused him to be angry and lose control. Subject is blaming others for his own inadequacies, and is using his previous gang affiliation as an excuse for his anger management problems. He indicated that any time he gets angry about something, his reaction is exaggerated by the fact that he previously used violence to solve his problems in the gang. Subject expressed a history of overreaction and anger response in many situations, both personal and professional.

The predominant impression is that the subject was probably only marginally affiliated with the gang and might best be described as a "wannabe." He could "talk the talk" to some degree, but the interviewer's impression is that he used the gang as an avenue to a sense of belonging and self-identification. The use and sale of illicit drugs were the primary motivators for continued gang affiliation.

SUBJECT 5

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject was a married, Marine Corps, E-5 who lived in several different locations while growing up, including two large cities in California. He moved around a lot because his parents were divorced. His father left home when he was two-years-old. He had two brothers and one sister, although he alone resided with his grandmother for approximately 12 years. Subject stated that he spent a significant amount of time hanging out with his friends in a fair and decent neighborhood, where there were very clear ethnic boundaries. He grew up learning how to fight, as the groups were constantly at odds. Subject talked about his relationships:

> I had about ten really close friends growing up. We were all of the same ethnic background.

The only reported confrontation with law enforcement officials was when two individuals pulled mace on his parents, which ended in his participation in a violent altercation. He was subsequently arrested, but the charges were later dropped, leaving him with a clean juvenile record.

Subject never admitted to being an active member of any established gang, although he and his friends were deeply involved in the trafficking of numerous illicit

drugs, including marijuana. He indicated that the dress he and his friends adopted was casual. He stated:

> We dressed for our culture, but most of the neighborhood used the same type of "slang" language.

He said his friends' most important concern was receiving respect from others. He indicated that he felt the same way:

> Everyone had to show the proper amount of respect, especially to the Veteranos, or the elders. Most of my friends would give up their life for me.

Subject indicated that he liked school, but was an average student. He stated that he oftentimes "ditched" school in order to drink. He later described himself as an alcoholic. He was only interested in school because it afforded him the opportunity to participate in sports, other extracurricular activities, and see his friends. The only academic subject that was of interest to him was mathematics.

Subject had a somewhat stable work background. He held his first job for approximately four years, both after school and in the summer. His main objective for working was to save enough money to buy a car. He held his second job as an electrician for another four years, but he eventually got tired of the long hours, and he wanted a

change, so he quit that job. He then did a short one-year tour in the Army Reserves. Subject stated his primary reason for joining the Marine Corps:

> I wanted to become a part of the Marine Corps family. The Marine Corps had the same code as me. I wanted to live by that. I was attracted to the ideals of duty, honor, integrity, loyalty, and respect. I was not running away from a negative situation at home, although my sister was pregnant and my two brothers had dropped out of school. My wife was also pregnant.

He stated that he was completely honest with his recruiter concerning his marijuana use, but required no moral waiver for enlistment. Subject spent approximately seven years on active-duty, and was then charged with premeditated murder and assault. He was subsequently sentenced to death.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject was extremely insistent about his true and deep love for his friends:

> I couldn't even describe the relationship to you in words, because it is beyond comprehension. I felt the same about my mother and stepfather. I was most happy during the early years of my life.

While on active-duty, subject talked about his performance:

> I was a truly outstanding Marine. I was meritoriously promoted to all ranks, except E-5. Then things in the Marine Corps started to spin out of control for me. I started to drink heavily to escape. I think I was an alcoholic. I loved the Marine Corps until everyone lost respect for each other in the unit. There was no honesty among the Marines in my unit anymore.

Subject stated that disturbing circumstances for him included such things as affairs within the unit, segregation by race, and visible command politics. He also indicated that other Marines started to become complacent about their appearance, which bothered him greatly. He described himself as a supervisor:

> I was a fair and honest supervisor. I always tried to help everybody out.

As he increased his alcohol consumption over time, he stated that he became angry and confused about the Corps, and his desire to belong to the organization. He described the overall unit morale as low, and the command climate as tense. He said it was reflected in the high rate of attrition.

> I lost the feel for the Marine Corps. I just said f--- the government. I didn't mean the United States government, I meant my unit.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

This ex-Marine was clearly engaging in deceptive plays-on-words, and active avoidance of the truth. He was neither completely honest nor forthcoming in this interview. His responses were fraught with innuendo and manipulation. When asked about the meaning of specific well-known gang-related tattoos and body markings, he was evasive:

> I can't tell you that. When my friend put it on me, I didn't know the significance.

The overarching impression is that this subject was extremely deceitful. His primary intention throughout the interview was to minimize personal responsibility for his actions, and to blame others and the Marine Corps for "letting him down." His testimony is rampant with contradictory statements, and his actions do not support his words. This subject reiterated numerous times what life means to him. His elusive response follows:

> It's about respect, most of which I can't tell you about.

This man attempted to make the interviewer believe he is truly sorry for his actions, yet he actually expressed little remorse for his crime. He was guarded, and his words were carefully chosen. He would not speak about his crime

directly. This soft-spoken man was very loud in the delivery of his message about respect. He was anxious and stated that he had not slept in days, which could have contributed to his mixed messages; although, the interviewer's impression is that his answers to the interview questions were extremely contrived. During the interview, the subject was more concerned about the respect he was getting from other inmates on the tier, than the interview itself. These actions and history do not support the subject's contention that he was never a member of a gang.

SUBJECT 9

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject was a black, 29-year-old, Navy E-5. He grew up in many different locations due to his father's profession, and lived in Michigan for a significant period of time. His mother had a Master's Degree in Business, and he had one sister and one brother.

Subject attended a junior high school as it was just beginning to integrate black students. He described himself as a good student, but as having very low self-esteem. He indicated that one reason for his low self-esteem was because he was one of the only black kids in the school. He indicated that he barely graduated. He stated that his grades started to decline when he started hanging out with the wrong crowd. He indicated that he was expelled from 8th grade for fighting. Subject was extremely active in track and field while in school.

Subject stated his main job was as a clerk at the local department store, where he worked after school and during the summers. He indicated, however, that working was contingent upon his keeping his grades up. When his grades started to suffer, his mother made him quit his job, and thus, he had more idle time on his hands while finishing school. He indicated that he was not fired from any job.

When subject was in the 9th grade, he made a conscious decision to join a gang. Most of his friends were from a middle-class neighborhood, and were also involved in the gang. He indicated that he soon became the "office boy" for the gang. He stated that he would answer the phones, beep people on their pagers, and set up times and locations for drug drops. This gang did not have colors, although they had a name, and they dressed in suits, including dress slacks and dress shoes. He said his gang's existence was all about making money, and their main activities included selling cocaine and opium, prostitution, and larceny of motor vehicles.

Subject also indicated that they were involved in helping illegal immigrants across the border, and were routinely involved in violent confrontations where individuals were "beaten-down," stabbed and killed. Membership in this gang was by invitation only, and was comprised of various ethnic groups including blacks, Guamanians, Asians, and Phillipinos.

Subject's main reason for joining the military was because several of his good friends were killed, and he indicated that he did not want to be the next casualty. He said:

> I realized that I would die or go to jail if I didn't leave the area. I joined the Navy to escape from my own death.

He was arrested as a juvenile but was never convicted, therefore, he had no juvenile record prior to enlistment. He stated that he was completely honest with his recruiter concerning his illegal activities prior to enlistment. He indicated that his recruiter bought him some herbal tea and told him to drink it to flush the marijuana from his system, and the recruiter also told him to say that he had only experimented with marijuana. He stated that he was advised by the recruiter to completely deny all gang affiliation. No moral waiver was required.

In boot camp, subject indicated that he was set-back numerous times because he was not a team player. He stated he was subsequently recycled through the program three times.

After almost ten-and-a-half years on active-duty, this man was convicted of exposure to a minor, and having an outstanding debt. He was sentenced to seven years of incarceration.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject decided to leave the gang when his best friend was killed. He described the circumstances surrounding his decision:

> My friend was going to make a drug drop for me because my mother was sick. He said he was cold, so I gave him my coat to wear. He was shot-to-death in a drive-by shooting no more than half a block away. I didn't want to go out with ten shots in my back. But the greatest high of being in the gang was that I was keeping this all from my parents the entire time. I would just mysteriously go down to the bank and put the money in my parents' account, or pay the bills.

Subject said that he went to "work" one day, and the entire place had been abandoned. He indicated that he thought someone had given up his name and there was a "hit" out for him. This is when he decided to join the military. Subject stated he had low self-esteem and that he always felt like he was not good enough. He described his feelings as follows:

> I didn't equal up to my brother or my sister, so I felt like I needed my own identity. I wanted to become a 'bad boy,' and I started getting in fights in school. I always helped the 'weaker vessels.' I was like a guardian. I was also angry at my father because he believed in the 'turn the other cheek' way of life. It made me mad. I wanted him to have heart, and I wanted to be respected. In the gang I was somebody, I was a cold-hearted fighter, and people wanted to be like me.

Subject felt like he was an "excellent sailor" while on active-duty. He indicated that his supervisors gave him good evaluations and he received numerous accolades from his command for high levels of performance. He also indicated

that he held a top secret security clearance for two years while he was serving onboard a nuclear submarine.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

Subject talked a big story from start to finish. He was intent on shocking the interviewer. This story may have been embellished so many times that he actually believes everything he is saying; although, the interviewer believes there is some truth to his story. The entire conversation was extremely amusing to him, and he laughed numerous times throughout the interview. He is very grandiose in his expression, and repeatedly made conflicting statements. He indicated that he is still a volatile personality:

> If someone walked up and spit on me today, I would blast him.

He was intent on impressing upon the interviewer his importance and the fact that many people fear him. This man repeatedly displayed manipulative behavior. He also expressed paranoid thoughts. He stated that at least 90 percent of the prison staff are spying on him, and he also believed that the interviewer was sent by the prison staff to spy on him. In addition, he has not taken personal responsibility for his crime. He denied all charges against him, with the exception of an indebtedness charge.

SUBJECT 10

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Five brothers and one sister comprise this subject's family, and they resided on the West Coast. He never met his father, as his parents were divorced when he was one-year-old. He expressed that his life was very unstable and that they were constantly moving. He indicated all of the neighborhoods in which he lived were low-income, predominantly residing in the projects. He said he took on a father-figure role since he was the oldest son. He felt compelled to take care of the family due to his father's absence.

Subject stated that he loved school, although he struggled with academics, as his home life was so unstable. He was expelled for being gang affiliated as a young child, and so were many of his friends. As youngsters, ages 10-13, he said that he and his friends were mostly "wannabes" with the gang. He said that the school he was attending had little tolerance for his deviant behavior. He stated that education was not encouraged by his mother, and he was never intimidated by her, so he did not worry about his grades.

Subject was mostly interested in athletics including football and basketball. Sports were his only motivator to pass his classes, as he didn't want to be prevented from

participating on the sports teams. He was expelled from school for numerous reasons including fighting and truancy.

His neighborhood was primarily segregated, and most of his friends were black. He indicated that some of his friends were killed, while others went to jail for participation in gang-related crimes. Subject indicated that he had cousins that were heavily involved in the gang:

> As a young kid I envied them because they were together, they were so tight, almost like a family. It was something that was cool at the time.

Subject was a member of the extremely notorious black gang, the Crips. They had colors, but were not tied to a particular type of dress in his neighborhood; although he indicated they most often wore khaki pants, T-shirts and had blue bandannas in their pockets. Subject has a tattoo that is a direct symbol of his gang membership. He made a conscious decision to join at age 13. He stated:

> I was drinking one night and I asked them to put me on the set, so they jumped me in. After you get jumped in, then everybody gives you love. It was like a celebration.

He indicated he was arrested and convicted once prior to enlistment for assault, and went to a juvenile home for two weeks.

After graduation from high school, he attended college for a year-and-a-half, and was extensively involved in the National Youth Sports Program, for low-income, inner-city kids. He also worked as a camp counselor for younger children during the summer. He was never fired from a job.

Subject was ultimately charged with desertion for approximately 45 days, and termination by apprehension. His sentence was 30 days confinement.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject talked about his school experience:

> I felt picked on when I was in school, and I felt that me and my friends were constantly being badgered by the administrative people once we were stereotyped to be a part of a particular group. That lead to me being irritated with the system. I got discouraged as a student. They weren't focused on me. They were after me. Even after I tried to get myself back on track no one was interested in my success because of my past track record. It made me angry. I had an anger management problem, and I attended many anger management classes because of my mouth. I was very outspoken.

He indicated that his favorite activity was working at the youth camp. He explained:

> I was very fulfilled working with the youth at camp because I could relate to them. I knew what they were going through. I knew I was reaching some of them.

Subject admitted that he might not have graduated from high school if his family had not eventually moved away from

his gang neighborhood. He stated that two of his basketball coaches were directly responsible for keeping him in school. Although he stayed in school, subject continued his gang affiliation. He spoke freely about the illegal activities of his gang:

> We were primarily involved in drug trafficking, and drive-bys. I felt good inside selling the drugs because I could help pay the bills, give my mom money. I knew it was wrong, but I justified it to myself because I was helping out my family. At first, I was really paranoid about getting caught. But after so long, you don't care. Goin' to jail was somethin' all your homeboys was doin', all your other friends talkin' about how much time they did. I envied it.

He then came to a point in his life where he decided to change his circumstances. He indicated:

> I didn't want to be a part of the gang any more, when I had to go to some of my best friends' funerals. We was in a car one day, and shots came through the windows as we were ducking. Some of my friends died.

The main reason subject enlisted was because he was married, and he had a daughter to support. He explained:

> I still associated with my friends from the gang, but I knew if I didn't keep myself busy, I would start to get into trouble again. I also felt that the military would allow me the means to provide for my family. I wanted to keep myself out of trouble.

He indicated that he was truthful with the recruiter about his gang history, and his juvenile arrest record. He was given a moral waiver for his drug use, but he was encouraged by his recruiter not to mention his gang associations at the MEPS station.

Subject stated that he enjoyed the Navy while on active-duty and he described the way he felt about his performance:

> I was a good sailor while I was on active-duty, I even had a secret security clearance. I scored higher than any of the other Operations Specialists (OS's) on the ship on the advancement exam. I also was the first to qualify as a watchstander while onboard my ship.

Subject indicated that he had one prior NJP for UA of approximately 3 hours. He was subsequently found guilty of desertion which was terminated by apprehension, and his sentence was 30 days confinement.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

Subject lived in a area where there is a known gang problem. He gave the impression of being honest and straightforward about his gang affiliation. He understands that it was wrong to go UA, but does not take full responsibility for his actions. He repeatedly described himself as severely depressed, and expressed that he has no

regrets for going UA from the Navy to take care of his family. Some of his statements were contradictory.

He embellished specific details of his story to elicit a reaction from the interviewer. He blames many of his problems as a juvenile on the fact that he did not have a father while growing up. He also blames many of his problems in the Navy on his wife. He indicated that most of his misfortune stemmed from the stress involved in the impending failure of his marriage, and the fact that he was drinking heavily. He also indicated that the Navy "cheated him" out of time with his family. He points the finger in many different directions, but rarely at himself.

SUBJECT 11

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject was born in Colorado, a 22-year-old Hispanic, male. He indicated that he was always around gangs, since he was a young child. He stated that his entire family was involved in gang activity. Gang membership was based on Hispanic ethnicity.

He grew up living predominantly with his mother. His father was a prior enlisted Marine, who was incarcerated while on active-duty on charges of burglary, drugs, and theft. His father was subsequently discharged, when subject was approximately four-years-old. Subject stated that his father was in trouble for his involvement with the Mexican Mafia.

His parents were then divorced, and he and his mother went to live with his grandparents. Subject stated that his two sisters were also in a lot of trouble with law enforcement officials for underage drinking, fighting, shoplifting, and running away from home.

Subject stated that he liked school, and his favorite subject was mathematics. He described his educational experience:

> I did pretty good in school, it's just that situations got me in trouble out of school. Me and my family wasn't getting along any more, so I

> started hanging out with my cousins when I just turned 15. I started making money from drugs with my cousins. When I was 16, I had my own money and a brand new car. I wasn't really paying that much attention to school.

Subject stated that he was expelled numerous times for truancy and fighting. He stated that he went to college for about a year, but he did not like it, so he quit.

His main employment was within the electronics and computer field. He stated that he needed a good paying job to legitimize the money that he was making selling drugs. He indicated that he intends to go back to work for this same company upon completion of his sentence. He pointed out that he had never been fired from a job.

Subject stated that he and his friends were repeatedly harassed by law enforcement officials in his hometown. He revealed that he felt it was based on their race:

> We were being harassed because of our gang affiliation and because we were Hispanic. They were always trying to intimidate us.

Subject was eventually charged with: missing ships movement by design; and unauthorized absence for approximately four months. He received a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD) and was sentenced to 90 days incarceration.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject indicated his primary reason for joining the military:

> I joined to try and stay out of jail, or not get into any more trouble. I was also involved in passing bad checks and I figured I would be charged with check fraud. If I joined the military, I could get away from some of the bad checks.

He stated that he was truthful with his recruiter about his involvement in illicit activities, but was told by the recruiter not to mention his gang affiliations at the MEPS. He received a moral waiver for underage drinking and fighting, and had a second waiver, the reason for which the subject could not recall. He stated that it might have been for his history of bad check writing. Subject indicated that he did not have a high school diploma, therefore, the recruiter enlisted him as an accession from another state where there were available quotas for GED applicants. He never held a military security clearance.

Subject still considers himself an active member of the Surenos gang. This gang has recognized colors, and hand signs. He wears a cross in the web of his thumb which signifies his gang membership, "mi vida loca" (my crazy life, under God). He talked about his gang:

> The rest of my cousins are all 'tatted down.' Most of my family and friends started disappearing. They were set up on murder and drug charges. All of them ended up leaving school anyway.

Subject worked on an aircraft carrier for approximately six months before going UA for approximately 14 months. He explained:

> The reason I went UA was because my mother got remarried and there was this guy from New York that beat her up really bad, and put her in the hospital. My sister was in a car accident and she had little kids and she couldn't take care of them. The Navy said I couldn't take leave. To me my family was more important, so I left. I went home, got my old job back, and took care of things while my mom was in the hospital. It was a conscious choice for me to leave the Navy, I turned myself in after my mom got better. I was good as far as the Navy was concerned. I pretty much did good in the Navy. I had trouble learning the stuff at first, but things got better.

Subject stated that he started hanging-out with other individuals who were on active-duty with the same gang affiliation. He stated:

> We were using and selling drugs while we were on active-duty. I know a whole lot of other people in gangs on active-duty. On my ship there were about 15-20 other 'gangbangers.' Most of them were related to me not by blood, but by ethnicity. Most of them were involved in the drug trade, but I don't know of them stealing any weapons from the military, but we had lots of weapons we bought out in town. At one point, I was shot in the chest with a shotgun, and I witnessed a guy getting beaten to death with a hammer.

He also indicated that he has plans for his future after incarceration. He elaborated:

> When I get out of here I want to go back to work, back to college. I want to eventually become an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT). I don't feel like this incarceration will affect my employment opportunities.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

This subject seemed to be frank in his discussion about his prior gang affiliation. He stated that he saw as much gang activity on active-duty as he saw off-duty, most of which was ethnically oriented. He knows his crime was wrong and readily admits it; however, he feels that his crime does not justify the length of his sentence. He feels like the Navy should consider extenuating circumstances in his case, due to his family problems.

Subject has a significant attachment to his family and believes this is his primary purpose in life. As an adolescent, he was somewhat egocentric in his view of the world. Some of his affiliations may stem from identity versus role confusion. This individual displays prolonged uncertainty about his role in life. He may have formed a negative identity, which manifested itself into delinquent adolescent behavior. Subject is calm, and seems to have come to terms with his punishment. He is realistic about

his future and stated that he intends to work hard to turn his life around after incarceration.

SUBJECT 12

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Ohio was the home-state of this subject; a 19-year-old, black male. He indicated that he moved around a lot, living in numerous large inner-cities. He described himself as coming from a low-class background, and he lived primarily with his mother and stepfather. He has two siblings, who are both significantly younger. Subject said he never had any true friends, only acquaintances.

This man indicated that he had several jobs while in high school and all were a means to get money for drugs, drinking and smoking. He indicated that he was fired a couple of times because he did not get along with the people he worked with. He also indicated that he was stealing money from the register, and pilfering food from his employers.

He told the interviewer that he had no interest whatsoever in school, or in extracurricular activities; most of his time was spent with his gang. He indicated that his stepfather taught him how to live on the street, because he was extensively involved in drug-dealing. He indicated that he had a bad attitude as a juvenile:

I did whatever I wanted, whenever I wanted.

The neighborhoods in which he lived were predominantly poor, and rough. He said he always had to watch out for gunfire just trying to go to school. His gang was called the "Folks." They had recognized gang hand signs and colors; blue and white. They wore khaki pants, blue dickeys, and white shirts with a blue "Nike" sign on the front. Each gang member had a recognized moniker (or nickname). They had a formal "jumping in" ceremony where he had to fight six people, for a minute each. He started getting into trouble with the gang when he was in 9th grade. He has a gangster brand on his arm that signifies that he "earned all his stripes" within the gang. He indicated his position:

> I started off as a gunny, someone who is considered to be a basic thug. This is how you prove yourself. Then I moved up into leadership positions where I was actually calling the shots myself as the OG of the set, because I did so much dirt. My pops was runnin' with the gang too, so I became affiliated. We were runnin' around stealing cars, robbin' people, and trippin' on other blocks.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject repeatedly stated that he isolated himself from others:

> I was pretty much a loner. I didn't like to associate with my co-workers. I considered myself more of a customer than an employee. I didn't like to talk to anyone.

He stated that he joined the gang for several reasons:

> I was looking for power, popularity, and respect. Once you were in the gang you could go anywhere, and nobody's gonna' mess with you. It was protection by your clique, but we don't accept women in our clique.

Subject indicated that he was harassed by law enforcement officials repeatedly as a juvenile. He said that as people were "doing dirt, and earning their stripes," the gang task force became well-informed about each member. The gang task force in his neighborhood maintained a file containing pictures of the subject and all of his tattoos.

This man stated that he had a normal home life while he was in high school, but that he got into trouble many times for carrying weapons, including a .38 Special, on school property, and for other infractions. He was subsequently enrolled in an Administrative Educational Program (AEP), which he indicated was similar to a juvenile study hall for problem children. He was in at least two separate juvenile facilities for 2-3 days each. He prided himself on evading the police, and thus, he did not have any juvenile arrests prior to enlistment. Subject indicated that he was involved in numerous drive-by shootings while in school.

Subject has no remorse for any of his illegal involvement. He stated:

> I never felt bad about what I was involved in, because I would see my boys drop dead at parties, somebody rolled up and sprayed the crowd, I'd see my boys bleedin' to death. I earned my stripes because I don't feel remorse for a lot of things. That was the way I isolated myself. I never worried about other people. I'm not afraid of death. It won't matter if I die because I did what I had to do. Tears not gonna' bring anybody back. If it's time to go, you gotta take it in stride.

Subject indicated the reason he joined the military:

> I wanted to be a legal killer. I wanted to join the SEALS and be an assassin. I told the recruiter I wanted to be a mercenary and go wipe out villages and since I had no remorse I wouldn't care about it, and if I came back and died I wouldn't care. I'm not scared to die. I had the mentality to kill people.

Subject was in the DEP program for approximately one year. He indicated that when he got to Recruit Training Command he was physically disqualified for SEAL training, and had to choose another Navy rating (or occupation). This was when he became angry with the Navy. He indicated that he was not straightforward with his recruiter about anything he was involved in prior to enlistment. Subject stated that the recruiter never asked about his associations and he did not offer any information. No questions were asked about his brand at the MEPS station while he was inprocessed for

service. Subject never had a security clearance while on active-duty.

When subject went UA, he indicated that his Chief told him if he kept up his present behavior he would eventually end up in the brig. He said that he made the following decision:

> I decided if was going to end up in the brig, I might as well do something worth going to the brig for, so I went UA.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

Interviewer believes that this man truly feels no remorse for his past associations or actions. He still maintains his affiliation with his "homeboys." However, some of his statements seem to indicate that he was trying to shock the interviewer. This man was/is a "hard core gangbanger" in the interviewer's impression. He is pessimistic and impulsive. Although he appears calm, he is extremely aggressive in nature. His actions are all motivated by his quest for "respect." He indicated the depth of his emotional instability as follows:

> I am not a very happy person. Death is the only thing that could make me happy, because then I could start all over again and I wouldn't have to deal with the traumas of everyday life. Everyday life is another day trying to survive. It's like trying to keep everything together. It's like a whole bunch of balls you're trying to keep rolling

> and they roll apart so every day you're runnin' around and makin' sure they're all there constantly and when one rolls off somethin's wrong.

Subject indicated that he would never have joined the Navy given a chance to live life over. He made an interesting analogy about the Navy within the gang context:

> The Navy was my 'set' while I was on active-duty. The United States of America is the gang. The President of the United States is like the OG of the gang. If somebody starts messin' with the President, the OG will go get his 'gunnies,' e.g. the Navy. Every branch of the service is a specific 'set' and my loyalty is to the Navy.

He indicated that no one else feels that way about the Navy. He stated that everybody lost respect for everybody else in his unit, and he blames the Navy for disillusioning him about respect and loyalty. He also indicated that there is no cohesion among sailors in the Navy anymore. This is a transference attitude. He blames the Navy for his own inadequacies and lack of success in the service.

SUBJECT 13

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject was born in the state of Illinois, and is a 20-year-old, single, black male. He is from a family where his father was an alcoholic and not around much, so he looked up to his older brother. He primarily grew up with his mother, brother and sister.

Subject indicated he attended a vocational high school and learned to work with sheet metal. He stated that after high school he got into trouble with law enforcement officials on a gun charge. He had been scheduled to take the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude and Battery (ASVAB) for entrance into service when he was arrested. The Air Force disqualified him for enlistment on the basis of the gun possession charge.

Subject described his neighborhood as a black, middle-class neighborhood, with all of his friends from the same geographic area. He stated that he never had a paying job while in high school. His only means of making money was selling drugs within the gang.

This man's gang was an offshoot of the "Nation" gang, and was recognized by the five-pointed Star of David. This gang wore red and black, T-shirts and jeans. There was no

formal "jumping in" ceremony. He indicated that his gang was mostly territorial in nature.

Subject had a juvenile conviction for the aforementioned gun charge, and he had several additional run-ins with law enforcement officials. He indicated that he was discriminated against because of his gang affiliation.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject stated that he made a conscious decision to join the gang:

> It was just something I wanted to do. I was mostly looking for friendship. In my eyes there was nothing wrong with it. You always knew somebody had your back. It was like a comfort zone, because people were gonna mess with you regardless. It felt really safe to be with my friends. I was always packin' for protection. It was an everyday thing for me. These were the people I identified with, and hung out with. You put the love to your heart. That was what the gang was all about.

This particular gang had a very structured rank hierarchy among its members. The gang had a Prince who was the highest ranking gang member, based on the fact that he had the most money; and money was power. Other ranks included Generals, President, Vice-president, Head Soldiers and Foot Soldiers. They capitalized on each individual's strengths. Subject indicated he was a Head Soldier, and was

heavily involved in the drug trade. It was all about making money. He commented:

> It was so easy to get money selling drugs, why should I get a job?

He said that he had seen many individuals "beaten-down" and killed in his neighborhood. The following event caused him to consider joining the military:

> Joining the military was my way out of going to jail. If I didn't enlist, I was gonna get two years for an 'unlawful use of a weapon' charge. The charge was dropped to a lesser offense, including 'not carrying a license for the gun.' The result was one year of probation and supervision, and the judge made military service an option for me. If I didn't do something different with my life, I was gonna' get killed.

He indicated that he was not truthful with his recruiter about his gang affiliation. Subject required a moral waiver for the weapons possession charge. Subject talked about his military performance:

> I was a good sailor up to a certain point. I didn't like being away from home, and there was lots of racism in my command.

He held a security clearance while serving on a Naval submarine. He had approximately two years on active-duty prior to incarceration for numerous charges including: receiving currency for arranging for sexual intercourse and sodomy; arranging for sexual intercourse and sodomy,

conspiracy; desertion; missing ships movement; reckless driving; wrongful use of marijuana; and three counts of simple Battery. He received a sentence of 18 months.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

Subject was quiet and reserved. The interviewer's impression is that the subject was honest about his gang affiliation. Although he appeared calm, this man is aggressive and impulsive. He was convicted of 13 charges, including resisting apprehension and arrest. He wants everyone to think he is "bad," and this type of attitude is consistent with the power associated with being a pimp. He has shown steady patterns of delinquent behavior, yet he blames his lack of success in the Navy on the fact that he hated submarine duty. He rationalizes that the Navy did not deliver what it promised him personally. He also admitted that he has a hard time getting past his gang involvement where he was always in control. He stated that he was going to do whatever he wanted, regardless of the Navy rules.

This man knows the difference between right and wrong, but acts as if he is untouchable. He maintains the naive perception that the Navy had no "right" to tell him what to do. There has been no pressure up until incarceration for this man to change his lifestyle, so he maintains all his old attitudes.

SUBJECT 15

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

The home of this subject the state of New York. He is a black, male Marine. He, his sister and brother lived in numerous places until he was about six-years-old. He stated that he has about 20 stepbrothers and stepsisters. His father was a police officer and his mother was a schoolteacher, although he was adopted and never knew his birth parents. He was also a foster child once. Subject has a twin brother who is currently incarcerated in the Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBOP) for selling dope.

Subject was involved in sports including track and basketball, and lived in an ethnically integrated middle-class neighborhood in New Jersey. He described his relationship with his friends as good, although he stated he was always trying to "keep his friends out of trouble."

Subject's gang was the Disciples of Love and Pleasure (DLP). He indicated this gang was an extension of the Gangster Disciples (GD), but was not based on ethnicity.

> We were a well-established gang, but we didn't have any gang hand signs or colors. My tattoos are specific to the gang, though. I gave myself a brand with a hot hanger once. I never had to be 'jumped in' with the gang. We were mostly about making money, and giving each other 'love.' I made a conscious decision to join the gang because it was like a family. We were all about protection for each other and our territory.

He indicated that there were many violent activities happening within his gang. He stated:

> We did a lot of bad stuff including drive-bys, but I only participated sometimes. My clique was selling drugs, but I never sold drugs. I was a high enough rank that I told people they had to tell me everything that was going on. The rank structure consisted of Number 1's, Number 2's and Number 3's. I am basically an OG.

Work experience included bagging groceries and other part-time work while in high school. He indicated that he had never been fired from a job. Subject stated that he had gotten into trouble with the law once as a juvenile for carrying a weapon [knife] into school.

Subject indicated that he was completely honest with the recruiter concerning his gang involvement prior to enlistment. In fact, he indicated that the recruiter talked to the judge on his behalf, with regard to the weapons charge. The recruiter did not encourage him to lie about anything, and subject signed a moral waiver for prior drug use of marijuana.

After approximately 4 years on active-duty, subject was charged with robbery, conspiracy to commit robbery, and unauthorized absence for 4 months. Subject received a sentence of 20 years.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject indicated that there was a lot of hostility among his brothers and sisters as young children. He explained further:

> There was no physical abuse in our family, we had a happy life, but there was also a lot of sadness. It was difficult with non-biological parents. There was a lot of rebelliousness among all of us kids.

He indicated that he was always the one in the most trouble, and he felt as if he had to compete with his brothers. He described his attitude:

> I could've done better if I'd applied myself in school. I loved science and history the most. I always wanted to go against the flow. I wanted to be my own person. I wanted to do what I wanted to do, not what other people thought I should do. It got me in a lot of trouble.

Subject described his reasons for joining the Marine Corps:

> I decided to join the Marine Corps because I needed to get my life together. I had a baby on the way, and I saw my life was not a good way to raise a family. I wanted to have my kid be able to make his own decisions about what he wanted to do with his life. I think I wanted to start a new life, and do what I always loved doing. The Marine Corps was going to let me be a cook.

Subject described his performance as a Marine:

> I was an outstanding Marine up until the military started to change for me. There was less respect up and down the chain of command.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

Subject wants the interviewer to believe he is a "bad individual." The interviewer believes he is a "hard core" gang member. He sees himself as a kingpin within his gang and feels that everyone exists to serve him. He stated unequivocally how the gang treats him:

> Things just come my way when I go home. I don't even have to ask.

This subject also admitted that he was extremely homophobic and indicated that he had participated in a hate-crime. He stated that he found out that a friend was gay, and he directed the rest of the gang members to force him to leave the area. He explained:

> He would never be allowed to participate with us again. I told him to leave and never come back. I won't have that in my set.

Subject indicated his feelings about authority figures in the Marine Corps:

> It's all about mutual respect, and the people in the Marine Corps owe me that. But they didn't give it to me, so why should I bother to respect any of them?

He stated that he had a history of problems with people in his chain of command. He sees himself as a fair, but firm supervisor. However, he indicated that he was not treated justly by his supervisors. This man repeatedly shifts the blame for his problems onto others.

Subject has a controlled demeanor; he is thoughtful and chooses his words very carefully in order to present himself in the most positive light possible. His story is inconsistent; he believes that he was "set up" for his crime, yet he also claims that he was the one who came up with the "master plan." His co-conspirator was kicked out of the Marine Corps for a pattern of misconduct, prior to execution of the crime.

This man wants to appear to be the victim, when in fact, he is the instigator. His ego defense mechanism is manifested through displacement of his aggression onto others. He also indicated that at one point he tried to commit suicide by ingesting pills. This was most likely an attention-getting scheme. He wants the interviewer to believe he is intelligent and wise beyond his years.

SUBJECT 28

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject grew up in Missouri and lived with his mother, stepfather, and two brothers. He was a black, 23-year-old, former Navy man. He described his family life as happy. He stated:

> I was spoiled, I got everything I wanted.

He was living in a neighborhood described as predominantly black. He indicated that his family stressed the importance of education very much. He was involved in track and cross-country throughout his primary years, and stated that he enjoyed participating in sports. Subject talked about his experience as a student:

> I was a good student, if I applied myself, but I got mostly C's. I started getting in trouble and I was eventually expelled from junior high school. It was because of my associations and affiliations. I started a brawl with other students and the school staff decided it was because of the gang rivalries. Some of the students involved were my affiliates and some others were not.

Subject stated that he became a member of the Gangster Disciples (GDs) at age 14. The gang had colors, hand signs, recognized tattoos, and brands. This gang was extremely well-organized, with a specific rank structure. Subject has

a gang-related brand, and numerous gang-related tattoos. He indicated that he made a conscious decision to join the gang.

> I was primarily involved in the gang for camaraderie. We all had something in common, it was a goal, and our main focus. We primarily wanted to make money, mostly drugs and a little bit of weaponry. We were only violent when we had to be. I was never caught, and it's only illegal if you get caught.

He repeatedly referred to his AO (area of operations) where he lived, and indicated that he dressed according to a strict "gangster" dress code. He described his status within the group as that of a "footsoldier":

> I still have ties to them. You can never run away from that, ever. They've been a part of me for more than 10 years. They are a part of my life, and we have the same goals, even if you're not from the same set. They are like my family. I'd give them my life if that's what they needed.

He described that for work, he held numerous "typical" high school jobs. He worked both after school and during the summers. He stated that he was fired from one job for "running a hustle;" basically, stealing from the company. He indicated that he was sent to reform school once for a semester, but ultimately graduated from high school. He had an official record when he decided to join the military. Subject stated his main reasons for joining the Navy:

> I joined because I had a family history of prior military service. My uncle encouraged me to join the Navy. I wanted to get away from the city. I thought if I stayed in the city, I knew retaliation was going to happen. I had a friend that was shot and killed while I was in high school. My girlfriend was also pregnant and I knew I couldn't afford to support her and raise a child. I wanted to be sure my son was well-taken care of.

He stated that he was advised by his recruiter not to say anything about the gang, or his drug involvement. He did not require a moral waiver. Subject indicated that he lied about his gang tattoos and said his brand was a fraternity brand. He informed the interviewer that he has maintained his gang affiliation the entire time he was on active-duty.

After almost two years on active-duty, this man was charged and convicted of rape, indecent assault, larceny of a motor vehicle, and weapons possession. He was sentenced to 49 years incarceration.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject indicated he liked school, up until about 3rd grade. He was then volunteered by his mother to participate in a local grade school desegregation program. He stated that he was the only black child in the school, and attended until junior high. While in school, he indicated that he

was extensively involved in the computer club, chess club, yearbook staff, and a member of student council.

After a while, he started getting into fights, and his mother gave him an ultimatum: either he would go into JROTC or he would go to juvenile hall, thus, he joined JROTC. He indicated that he liked JROTC the first year, but after that his interest started to decline. Subject described his feelings about the service as follows:

> I knew early on the military wasn't for me. I would never join the military again. I asked to be discharged while I was still in boot camp, but the Navy would not release me. I enjoyed my job but I didn't like the military.

Subject stated that he knows many other individuals on active-duty that are involved in gangs. He stated that most of the gang associations are based on similar life history background and interests.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

In the interviewer's impression, subject was one of the most "hard core" gangsters interviewed thus far. He "talked the talk," and the interviewer believes he was involved in most of the activities in which he claimed involvement. This man spent the entire interview bragging about his illegal activity, and then contradicted himself numerous times, stating that he was only involved in violence when

necessary. He was extremely proud that he was never arrested as a juvenile. Throughout the interview, he repeatedly referred to his "associates and affiliates." This man is impulsive and aggressive. He repeatedly rationalized his illicit behavior and the interviewer's impression is that this man perceives himself as an intellectual. He is very arrogant. He said:

> Pay close attention to what I'm telling you. You need to understand this.

He wanted the interviewer to comprehend the intellectual capacity required to get away with some of his juvenile crimes. He is extremely impressed with himself, and yet takes no responsibility for his crime. He maintains he is falsely accused. He rationalizes that he was victimized by other individuals and by the military system.

SUBJECT 30

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject grew up in California and lived with his mother and father, one sister and two brothers. He reported no physical or sexual abuse, and no problems with alcohol abuse in the family. He stated that he lived in a middle-class, predominantly Chicano neighborhood. His circle of friends included neighbors and schoolmates. He was married at age 19.

Subject indicated that he liked school, but he liked sports better. He primarily participated in boxing. He described himself as an average student, and admitted that he could have done better if he had applied himself. He was expelled for a week for fighting in junior high school.

Subject stated that he worked at several different jobs while in high school, and during each summer. He indicated that he had been fired because he stopped showing up for work.

This man was a member of a notorious Mexican gang, and he has numerous gang-related tattoos to signify his membership. He joined the gang around age 11, and was "banging" throughout high school. He was officially "jumped in" and "beaten-down." Members were also required to participate in a drive-by shooting in order to join. He

indicated that he grew up in this environment and joining was automatic. Many of his relatives were involved in the gang, of which, membership was based primarily on ethnicity. Subject indicated his reasons for joining the gang:

> Our main reason for the gang was to represent the red rag. There were many rival gangs in our area, and they each had a hierarchy. My rank and position in the gang were based on my fighting skills. I was an OG in one gang and then I was promoted into an older gang. The gang was also involved in drive-by shootings, assaults and other illegal activities, but our primary reason was for money-making, mostly in the drug trade. I was considered to be the gang 'heavy.'

Subject got into trouble with the juvenile authorities and spent approximately eight months in a juvenile detention facility. He indicated that he was repeatedly harassed while growing up by law enforcement officials, due to his gang affiliation. Subject stated his main reason for joining the Marine Corps:

> After I got out of jail [juvenile hall] my parents had moved, so there was no reason for me to stay in my home town. I had a buddy who joined with me. It was something new and different. I did not admit my gang affiliation, and the recruiter didn't ask.

Subject required two moral waivers: one for his juvenile detention center record, and another for prior drug use.

Subject was ultimately convicted of first degree murder, conspiracy to commit murder, and assault and battery. This man initially received a life sentence, which was later commuted to a period of 50 years.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject talked about why he initially joined the gang:

> I joined the gang because it made me feel good. My cousins were members and I got respect. We all ran together. When I got older I got into other things and made a choice.

Later on, he stated that he used the Marine Corps as a way to get out of the gang, although his delinquent behavior continued:

> I was a motivated Marine, and I had very high pro and con marks on my evaluations, 4.9, 4.9. Then I started drinking a lot, and got myself into trouble for disrespect to my First Sergeant. I got extra duty for it. Then I started using drugs, including cocaine. I started spending lots of money, and living the high life, for about a year.

He stated that he also had problems at his last duty station as follows:

> I started to get into trouble because things were so racially divided. There were many other 'gangsters' on active-duty with me, but I would join the Marine Corps again if I had it to do all over.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

This man is a life-long gangster. He admitted that his crime was a gang execution. He indicated that he was an OG in the gang, and that he called the "hit" on the victim for being a "snitch." The victim "ratted" on several of the gang members who were extensively involved in stealing government property. His victim was brutally murdered; stabbed at least 14 times in the execution. This was a violent premeditated murder, which was carefully planned and executed.

He was calm throughout the interview, but is extremely aggressive and volatile. He admits he is guilty and takes full responsibility for his crime, but feels like his sentence is too severe for his crime. He also deeply believes in the "code" as espoused by his gang, including "respect at all cost." He indicated that he is sorry for his crimes and that he has since "forgiven" the other gang members who "gave him up for the murder."

In addition to his violent crime, this man has a history of violence within the prison since his initial incarceration.

SUBJECT 31

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Subject was born in the state of California, and relocated to the South when he was eight-years-old. He lived with both biological parents, three brothers and a sister, until age 16. He indicated that his home life was extremely turbulent and that he had a tough time growing up. He revealed that his father was a serious alcoholic, and that he was physically and emotionally abused. He indicated that his mother also had problems with alcohol, and two of his brothers were drug addicts. His neighborhood was described as a middle-class neighborhood in the inner city. Subject stated that he had other reasons for going to school that were more important to him than education:

> It was a good reason for me to get out of the house, otherwise, I could care less about school. I always had a problem dealing with people, and I only had two close friends.

Subject indicated that he had many problems in school because of his negative attitude, and to escape, he started drinking and doing a lot of drugs. He described himself as a below average student. He indicated that he was expelled from 4th grade for deviant behavior. He described his main interest in school:

> I always tried to live up to my brothers' reputation, but mostly I just went to school so I could participate in athletics, like football, track and field.

He also stated that he won an athletic scholarship for track and field, and that he attended college for about three years. He stated:

> I wasn't really prepared for college, because I didn't have the academic background. I didn't do very well anyway.

Job experience for this man included several typical high school jobs, and he indicated that he was never fired by an employer.

Subject joined the Navy because he was given an ultimatum by a judge. He was expelled from college as a result of an arrest for disturbing the peace and trespassing. The judge indicated that he could either serve two weeks in jail and perform community service, or he could join the military. He decided to join the Marine Corps. He stated that he was truthful with his recruiter concerning his gang and drug use. He indicated that he needed multiple waivers for his arrest, traffic tickets, and drug use. He explained:

> I had already been expelled from college so I figured I might as well enlist.

Subject served on active-duty for approximately 18 months and was incarcerated for conspiracy and unpremeditated murder. He had a pre-trial agreement for life, but his sentence was commuted to 30 years in prison.

B. ATTITUDINAL DISCUSSION

Subject was proud of himself for never having gotten caught participating in illegal activity as a juvenile. He indicated:

> My gang was mostly like a 'crew.' [a smaller version of a gang]. We didn't have signs and colors, and no proper name. We were mostly involved in robbery, drug use, and drug sales including weed, acid, and dust. We usually robbed people in bus stations, and in parking lots at the mall. We never used weapons, we just used to intimidate people with numbers. I was lucky though, I never got caught doin' any of that illegal stuff when I was young.

Subject described his performance while on active-duty:

> I was an excellent Marine, and I got good evaluations. I only used to get in trouble in my off-duty time. One night I gave myself a brand with a clothes hanger I heated up on the stove. I wanted to hurt myself, but I didn't. I got myself into trouble one night when I was with my friend. We started robbing people and we were in a contest to see who could outdo the other in crime. The whole time I was on active-duty, we stole stuff that was easy to sell. I was using and selling drugs too, drinking beer and getting high. We used to steal things just to see if we could get away with it.

Subject indicated that he was an angry drunk and that he and his crime partners were involved in numerous illicit activity while on active-duty. He indicated his reasons for participating, and the extent of his involvement in illegal activity:

> I did it because I felt like my life was going nowhere. We even thought about robbing a bank once. We never did steal any military weapons. I never even carried a weapon, it was all about intimidation, but I knew someday we would kill somebody. I guess I really wanted to get caught. We weren't even sure if he [the victim] was dead or alive when we left him.

C. CLINICAL IMPRESSIONS

Subject is an extremely aggressive and violent man, who is motivated by the power associated with intimidation of his victims. This man appeared to be honest and forthright about his past associations. The interviewer believes he feels as though he does not have anything to lose by telling his story. Subject stated that he knows he was wrong and his behavior is unacceptable, however, he does not appear to be remorseful concerning his murder victim.

Subject is lacking in self-confidence, and is highly impressionable. He is not a particularly ambitious person, and has no specific goals after release. His measure of personal success is based on acquisition of material possessions, and he looks up to those who have money and

power. He indicated that he still has anger management problems, and stated that he will be glad to be on parole upon release, so he will be accountable to someone for his actions. The interviewer believes this man does not trust himself, and is concerned about his potential for further illegal involvement upon release.

APPENDIX B. INFORMED CONSENT FORM.

I understand that this is a study about gangs, extremism, and the military. I will be asked questions about my gang association, extremist ideals and criminal activity. I understand that my answers to the questions will not be shared and will not affect my sentence in any way.

I understand that my name or social security number will not appear in the results of the project and my identity will not be revealed. The information is confidential and will only be used by LT Tierney for completion of the project.

I have read and understand the above information and I agree to talk to you.

SIGNATURE: _____

NAME (PRINT):_____

INTERVIEWER:_____

APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Tell me about your family.
2. Tell me about your educational experience/school.
3. Tell me about your work experience prior to joining the military.
4. How do you feel about your performance while on active duty? Did your job require a security clearance?
5. What was going on in your life when you decided to join a gang (before/after military enlistment)?
6. Why did you join the military?
7. What kind of neighborhood did you live in when you were growing up/while on active duty?
8. Tell me about your friends.
9. What type of trouble did you get into with the juvenile authorities?
10. Tell me about your gang. What types of tattoos do you have?
11. Tell me about the crime you committed that brought you here.
12. What kinds of experiences have you had in the past with police/law enforcement officials?
13. Do you know other individuals on active duty who are involved in gang activity?

14. Were you truthful with military personnel about everything you were involved in prior to enlistment (include recruiter, MEPS personnel, security screening personnel)?
15. Is there anything about your gang, neighborhood, school, work, your family, or your friends, that I didn't ask that you'd like to tell me?
16. What are your goals after you're released?
17. If you could live your life over, what would you do differently?
18. Is there any reason why the military might want to exclude former gang members from enlisting?

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION

1. Defense Technical Information Center 2
   8725 John J. Kingman Rd., Ste 0944
   Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

2. Dudley Knox Library 2
   Naval Postgraduate School
   411 Dyer Rd.
   Monterey, CA 93943-5101

3. Professor Mark J. Eitelberg 1
   Systems Management Department
   Naval Postgraduate School
   555 Dyer Road
   Monterey, CA 93943

4. Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff 1
   Defense Personnel Security Research Center
   99 Pacific St., Bldg 455, Suite E
   Monterey, CA 93940

5. Dr. W. S. Sellman 1
   Director for Accession Policy
   OASD (FMP)
   4000 Defense Pentagon
   Washington D.C. 20302-4000

6. Commander Susan Walters, USN 1
   Commanding Officer
   Naval Consolidated Brig Miramar
   46141 Miramar Way, Suite
   San Diego, CA 92145-5498

7. Mr. Chuck King 1
   Director, Navy Corrections program Evaluation
   Naval Consolidated Brig Miramar
   46141 Miramar Way, Suite 1
   San Diego, CA 92145-5498

8. CWO3 Lynn Mershon, USMC 1
   Brig Officer
   Base Brig, Marine Corps Base
   Box 555226
   Camp Pendleton, CA 92055-5020

9. Colonel Marvin Nickels, USA 1
Commandant
United States Disciplinary Barracks
300 McPherson
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

10. Dr. Bruce Leeson 1
Directorate of Inmate Administration
United States Disciplinary Barracks
300 McPherson
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

11. Director, Corrections and Programs Division 1
Department of the Navy (PERS-84)
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Washington D.C. 20370-5000

12 Lieutenant Kathryn E. Tierney, USN 2
740 N.E. 6th St.
Earlham, IA 50072-1019

66 553NPS TH 3748
11/99 22527-106 NULF

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
3 2768 00366446 7